DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 427 95 IR 002 525

AUTHOR	Silverman, Robert J.; Collins, Erik L.
TITLE	The "Gatekeeper" Role in Educational Journal Publishing. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Research Foundation.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	R-1
BUREAU NO	BR-3-1104
PUB DATE	May 75
GRANT	NE-G-00-3-0050
NOTE	135p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Editing; Educational Research; Evaluation Criteria; Individual Characteristics; Information Dissemination; Journalism; Periodicals; Policy; Publications; *Publishing Industry; Questionnaires; Research Projects; *Scholarly Journals; Standards; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Editors; Gatekeeper Role

ABSTRACT

To explore the demographic, professional and ideational dimensions of educational-journal editors and to investigate publishing processes in general, questionnaires were sent to a list of journal editors and in-depth interviews were held with eight editors, two each from research, scholarly, professional, and association publications. Journal-author relationships, criteria for manuscript selection, and anticipated futures of education were discussed and data was analyzed. Conclusions were drawn about systematic attention to editorial practices and editorial success within their environments. Suggestions were made for editorial workshops which might provide for better service and greater accountability to the field. (SK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED 114427

FINAL REPORT

THE "GATEKEEPER" ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL PUBLISHING

National Institute of Education
Project No. 3-1104

Robert J. Silverman
Erik L. Collins

The Ohio State University
Research Foundation
Columbus, Ohio

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

May, 1975

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

IR 002 525

RF Project 3751

Report No. 1

FINAL

REPORT

By

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
RESEARCH FOUNDATION

1314 KINNEAR RD.
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43212

To NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
Code 600
Washington D. C. 20202

Grant No. NE-G-00-3-0050

On THE "GATEKEEPER" ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL PUBLISHING

For the period 27 June 1973 - 31 January 1975

Submitted by Robert J. Silverman, Department of Special Services
Erik L. Collins, Department of Journalism

Date May 1975

PREFACE

The senior author acknowledges with gratitude the support of the National Institute of Education (Grant #NE-G-00-3-0050) which allowed the project to take the form it did. With many current examples of poor response rates to survey research, it was crucial to print an instrument and use procedures of the highest caliber. NIE support made that possible.

There are many who shared in the work of this project whose contributions are appreciated. Professor Erik Collins, The Ohio State University, collaborated in the survey design and field interviews. Ms. Susan Salita supervised the survey, coded data and participated in numerous activities of the project. Ms. Cheryl North wrote one chapter of the final report and edited it in its entirety. Mrs. Phyllis DeMuth typed tables for the over two hundred variables, a job better remembered than anticipated, and typed this report.

There were one hundred and thirty editors who agonized a solid hour or more completing our instrument and eight dedicated editors who graciously spent a half day in interviews with us. Their acquaintance will be remembered as highlights of this report.

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this exploratory study were to gather and interpret data focusing on demographic, professional, and ideational dimensions of education journal editors and on publishing processes in the field of education.

After surveying the population of editors, the journals were categorized as either research, scholarly, professional, or association publications. Two journal editors in each category were interviewed in-depth.

Data focusing on a variety of topics, such as journal-author relationships, criteria for manuscript selection, and anticipated futures of education are displayed according to the four journal types. Clear differences exist in the editing procedures among the journal categories.

Editor interviews suggest their interest in influencing education research and practice and their self-perceptions as Renaissance type individuals. Perhaps the most important finding is the lack of systematic attention by editors to editorial practices. Editors seem to be resourceful in negotiating among the forces within their particular environments. However, their roles as gatekeepers of communication media have received insufficient attention. Workshops for new and seasoned editors might allow better service and greater accountability to the field.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Educational Communication 1
The Editor 3
Objectives of the Study 5

2 METHODOLOGY 7

Basic Methodological Considerations 7
Questionnaire 8
Pilot Study Pretest 8
Results of Pilot Study 9
Main Data Gathering Procedures 9
Field Case Study 11
Journal Categories 12

3 EDITORS AND THEIR PUBLICATIONS 15

Tenure 15
Previous Service - Current Journal 16
Previous Service - Other Journals 18
Process of Choosing Editor 20
Length of Term 20
Percent Total Time as Editor and Other Role Positions 21
Time Devoted to Specific Editorial Duties 25

4 PRODUCTION 31

Editorial Board Members 31
Staff 34
Interviews 36
Editor-Author Relationships 38

5 PROCESSES RELATED TO MANUSCRIPT SELECTION 43

The Broader Context 43
Manuscript Processing 45
Papers Received 45
Criteria for Manuscript Selection 50
    Process criteria 50
    Content criteria 54
Book Reviews 58
Personal Interviews 59

TABLE OF CONTENTS - (Continued)

Chapter		Page
6	PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	61
	Educational and Occupational Background	61
	Personal Interviews	67
7	MY CREDO	69
	My Prime Responsibility	69
	Sources of Assumptions	71
	Future of Education	76
	Interviews	86
8	CONCLUSIONS	91
9	RECOMMENDATIONS	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY		97
APPENDIX A		105
APPENDIX B		106
APPENDIX C		107
APPENDIX D		108
APPENDIX E - FORMAT OF PERSONAL INTERVIEWS		109
APPENDIX F - JOURNALS INCLUDED IN STUDY		112
APPENDIX G - JOURNAL GATEKEEPER QUESTIONNAIRE		115

LIST OF TABLES

Table No. Page

1 Editors' Tenure 17

2 Previous Service - Other Journals 19

3 Time - Editor's Role 21

4 Editor Roles: Research Editors 22

5 Editors: One or More Roles 24

6 Editors: Major Roles 24

7 Editors: Policy Development 29

8 Editors: Design and Lay Out 30

9 Selection of Editorial Board Members 32

10 Function of Editorial Board 35

11 Disposition of Manuscripts by Editor 47

12 "Early" Acceptance 48

13 "Early" Rejection 48

14 Criteria for Acceptability: Process 51

15 Criteria for Acceptability: Content 55

16 Editor's Responsibility 70

17 Editor's Differentiation Ability 77

The Gatekeeper Role in Educational Journal Publishing

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Educational Communication

Fields of study, both "pure" and "applied" rely heavily on formal communication mechanisms for the realization of their immediate goals and larger purposes. Education, an applied professional field, has the communication media and processes inextricably woven into its fabric. This is quite clear through an examination of the basic definition of a profession. Schein (1972, 89) indicates that professionals "possess a specialized body of knowledge and skills that are acquired during a prolonged period of education and training ... make decisions on behalf of a client in terms of general principles, theories, or propositions, ...[and] have great power and status in the area of their expertise, but their knowledge is assumed to be specific." An area of study, then, can be considered a field to the extent that there exists formal communication channels which assume: the sharing of tried and new knowledge within a collegial or professional group, the development and improvement of methods of professional application, and for both their relationship to preparation programs in the schools.

Nagi and Corwin (1972, 2) in their discussion of research, indicate that "claims to knowledge are ... restricted to communicable and public constructions of reality within systems of widely shared and accepted thought processes." Further, cognitive processes have action implications. Oppenheimer notes (McNaul, 1972, 275):

> "I think there is an element of action inseparable from understanding: to question, to try, to adapt, to ask new questions, to see if one understands, and to test what has been told: action in the laboratory or the observatory, or on paper, or, at the very least, in the motions of the spirit."

Similarly, communication also focuses on new directions for action thus influencing the questions treated in research, client relationships, and in the long run, the state of our social system. Unfortunately, there is neither a rich literature nor an adequate understanding of communication processes, needs, or interests among practitioners or between those who create and those who use knowledge.

Schein (1972, 39) does not attend clearly to the communication-oriented aspects of professional need. In this forward-looking document sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, he refers to the knowledge explosion which "acts as a strong stimulant to specialization, ... the task of a generalist in a world in which the knowledge base becomes increasingly difficult, ...[and] the likelihood of early obsolesence.

McNaul (1972, 280) observes that there is not only "a lack of data and consensus on what patterns of communication exist in applied activities, ... there is [also] an absence of conceptual models for the process of communication among practitioners analogous to contribution/recognition exchange in scientific communication." His work suggests the "relative lack of use of journals in applied work" (1972, 280) with a higher utilization of informal channels, namely the needs of the clients as they define them.

Deats [1974] explores dissemination issues in his excellent paper, "Moving and Using Information" in education. He suggests there are shared assumptions and conceptual orientations which must be examined and which include:

> 1. The belief that information is a rather stable commodity which can be transferred from person-to-person, from place-to-place, from system-to-system, across different temporal orders and be utilized by different people and organizations in much the same manner as physical artifacts.
>
> 2. A common conceptual confusion of data systems which results in the assumption that the available technology and techniques determine the effectiveness and design of communication systems; and the related conceptual failure to recognize that human communication systems are behaviorally inductive and one determined by the generic process of communication rather than by the technology.
>
> 3. The relatively widespread assumption that if correct information is available, correct (i.e., successful) decisions will be made.
>
> 4. The assumption that correct information can be specified in advance for many, if not most, educational situations and activities within an educational system, primarily because one can establish correct goals and criteria for education.
>
> 5. The generally held belief that the failure of many educators to use much of the current educational research data is a communication problem which can be solved through tactical procedures such as repackaging messages in different media.
>
> 6. The general tendency in the literature to view more communication as intrinsically better than less communication between individuals in educational systems ....
>
> 10. And, perhaps most importantly, the fundamental assumption that the setting of specific and determinate goals or criteria for information and knowledge utilization is not

10

> only a virtue, but that it is possible to establish such criteria for others beside oneself.

The author suggests the complexity of the transactional relationship which exists between media products, their producers, and their consumers (390), noting:

> "the sufficient condition for information utilization within any human social system always inheres in the salience of the information for a specific community of individuals in time and location. The traditional approaches to testing or measuring impact or effect of information in or on an audience largely fail to take into account the ways in which people in a given community talk about what is important to them in that community context."

Although the utility of books and articles directed toward the professions needs serious study, participants in the applied area of education must agree that considerable resources are spent in professionals' communication oriented activity, from preparing manuscripts for publication to the cost in time and money of subscribing to and reading the media.

The communication media also address issues relating to education for the professions. An attempt to develop perspectives on this literature is represented by Bragg and Anderson's (1974) paper, "Journals of Education for the Professions: A Preliminary Study." Among other parameters the authors graphed the percentage of space devoted to standards and ethics, recruitment, curriculum and instructional methodology, external relations, and field experience and education for a twenty-five year period. They identify those topics which receive the greatest attention and conclude, "the fluctuations in concern for these topics were seen as responses to pressures on the individual profession ...." (1974, 15).

Although we have a primitive understanding of the communication system in the field of education, an area composed of practitioners, researchers, educators, with systems speaking to each component and to their interactions, one portion of the system's functioning remains virtually ignored - the role of the editor in directing the media.

The Editor

There is a curious lack of empirical recognition of the editor's role and impact on the direction of publications, and, consequently, on the field. It may be that our notions of leadership are too traditional. Although we have studied various dimensions of the more obvious "line" leadership, such as superintendents and presidents, we have not examined those who provide cognitive leadership.

Lyman Glenny (1971), in his pregnant paper on the anonymous leaders in education, suggests many roles are powerful because they control areas of organizational and professional uncertainty: admissions and financial aid officers in higher educational institutions, staff in state agencies are as influential as they are hidden. The editor not only has influence over what a profession reads but also a more subtle impact on the direction of a field ... by suggesting and enforcing certain methodologies in knowledge creation, rewarding those who are invited to submit papers and choosing referees who judge the work of their peers. They can even influence the meaning of a paper through a value-laden choice of the articles surrounding it in a given journal issue.

Despite the significant leadership responsibilities placed on editors, it is a trust which is poorly understood by scholars and principals. This substantive failure is mirrored in the brief literature which appears on the subject.

"Congratulations and commiserations! You will soon be getting letters of exaggerated respect and disrespect, flattery and insult. You will be acclaimed by some contributors, and find yourself unknown to others who send their manuscripts to an editor thrice-removed. You will bask in the almighty power to accept or reject, and suffer at your impotence to get authors to write clearly," says Hyman Rodman in his "Notes to An Incoming Journal Editor" (1970, 269). Though well tempered by his editorial responsibilities, there is no attempt to examine alternative positions to those he takes, and frequently the tone of the paper is ill-suited to the trust involved. "The editor's primary function as gate-keeper -- deciding which articles to admit for publication -- must take precedence over his secondary function of educator. It is difficult enough to edit a journal without also running a correspondence school for would-be authors" (1970, 272).

In his "Moral Responsibility of Journal Editors and Referees," (1970), we learn, by his emphasis, that the most flagrant violation of editorial responsibility speaks not to substantive concerns but to a delayed response for which Rodman has a proposal.

Authors express their discontent through letters to editors, one captioned "Needless Pains Caused by Heedless Editors" suggests "I have seen many, many letters which have been passed on to authors which are little more than scurrilous personal diatribes, thinly veiled as scientific criticism" (Page 1965). There are a variety of suggested editorial practices which appear in these letter and commentary sections of professional publications, suggestions that referees not be anonymous (Cahnman, 1967), or that editorial decisions be appealable (Newman, 1966), among many others. However, systematic analyses of issues are absent. Those editors who write about their roles, infrequent as such writing is, maintain the image of high priesthood initiating the layman into the operational complexities of their work (Goudsmit, 1969). Though the ancedotes may entertain and the recommendations may be sound, there is brief attention to the deeper responsibilities of editors or discussions of decision rules which are used as they work with the papers submitted for publication.

Although this failure is serious enough for all fields, it is especially troublesome for those which entertain different schools of thought or paradigms and those which attempt to speak to a diverse constituency - philosophically and operationally (Kuhn, 1962). The structure of knowledge in physics may entertain few substantive choice points upon which editors may have an impact; such is not the case in the relatively young, changing, and complex field of education. Jerome Ravetz (1971), in his discussion of immature fields of study, indicates "it is through ... methods, ranging from the techniques of production data, to the judgments of adequacy on an argument, that pitfalls are identified and ways around them charted." Craft knowledge is difficult to develop in an immature field, and "is not a straight forward operation" (Ravetz, 1971, p. 369). It requires the endeavors of a person "of exceptional talent and dedication" with a "strongly marked personal style, both in the scientific and social aspects of his work, and probably a personal commitment to a goal which is deeper than the mere establishment of positive knowledge in the field" (Ravetz, 1971, p. 370). It can be argued that editors might play a significant role in this leadership function. They are educators as they work with authors, helping them to improve their work according to certain disciplinary models and educational assumptions, and by providing examples in each issue of the journal of work which would qualify for dissemination and anticipated utilization by the broad community of interest.

There are academic fields which have spent considerable effort in studying the relationship between its communication resources and the needs of its members. In psychology, Garvey and Griffith's (1971) "Scientific Communication: Its Role in the Conduct of Research and Creation of Knowledge" a complex study followed by responses from the field, is but one example of this effort to understand and plan for approaches which maintain quality control and meet user needs. Although editors in the field of education have conducted surveys of reader interest, there is no comprehensive study which examines some of the deeper, complex issues implicit in the publishing process.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are:

1) To gather and interpret data focusing on the demographic, professional, and ideational dimensions of educational journal and publication editors. Included among the questions related to this objective are those concerned with their age; sex; race; publications; membership in professional and community organizations; education and position history; how chosen for the editorship; how editorial time is allocated; experiences and individuals, past and present, who have (had) a major impact on their educational perspectives; and their anticipated futures

of education, including the potential roles their publications ought to play in realizing those futures.

2) To gather and interpret data focusing on the publishing process. Among the questions which speak to this board concern are criteria for choosing editorial board members and the procedures used in their selection; the journals' publishing procedures reflecting author relations; the flow of the manuscript review process and disposition of papers, by percentage; and the process and content criteria used in manuscript selection.

This research is basically exploratory. It is designed, on one level, to provide basic data regarding the objectives noted above; its import, however, is to allow members of the field to question a professional activity which has been heretofore hidden, not by editors' design, but because of an unquestioning posture by the field. Currently, educationists' attitude toward publishing can be measured only through subscription choice -- except for association publications which come as a privilege of membership. The authors believe this research will legitimate open discussion and greater choice by the field over the direction their publication takes and who will provide the leadership.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Basic Methodological Considerations

The idea of developing the academic gatekeeper research project originated with the practical and philosophical interests in editorial processes, functions and roles of Dr. Silverman and the concerns of Dr. Collins with decision making in the communications situation.

The first task was to decide which research design should be employed. Since gathering information, not establishing cause-and-effect relationships between and among variables, was the prime requisite, it was decided a non-experimental design was the most appropriate for the research. The actual design selected was, using Haskins' notation, (1968) a one-shot study. The following is an illustration of the one-shot design:

	t1	t2	t3
P1	--	--	M

As the illustration shows, the one-shot study employs some forms of measurement of dependent variables to obtain descriptive information about a population or sample. To obtain the descriptive information necessary for this study it did not appear necessary to adopt any of the more sophisticated designs described by Campbell and Stanley (1966) or by Haskins (1968).

The dependent variables (or things measured) in this research were the attitudes, opinions, and facts about the editorial processes of academic journals in education obtained from verbal statements by the journal editors.

The second basic decision concerned the types of data collection methods to be employed. The requirements were that they be usable for gathering the wide range of information desired from respondents in widely diverse geographical locations. The methods chosen were a mail survey augmented by eight in-depth personal interviews. The mail survey, based on the findings and experience of Erdos (1970), has been found uniquely suited to gathering a large volume of information from a large, diversified and geographically scattered population. Additionally mail surveys have the advantages of keeping at a minimum any personal antagonisms that may occur between the survey subject and a personal interviewer, the questions may be standardized, and the survey may be filled out at the convenience of the respondent. Because of the familiarity of the researchers with the techniques of mail surveys, and because of newly published research about mail surveys uncovered in the course of the review of methodological sources, it was decided that the traditional principal drawback to the use of the mail survey -- a low rate of response -- could be overcome. Using the newest experimentally tested techniques for improving the response to mail surveys, the researchers have achieved return ranges between 65% and 80%. It was decided that a response from sample editors of 65% or better would be acceptable for the purposes of this research project.

The eight follow-up, in-depth interviews were utilized to supplement and enrich the data obtained from the mail survey. It was felt that open-ended plus probing questions in a relatively unstructured personal interview, while not suited to gathering information from a large population or sample because of cost, time and other methodological constraints, would more than adequately provide the background information desired by the researchers as complementary data.

Questionnaire

A preliminary mail survey questionnaire was developed as an instrument for pretest purposes. The questionnaire was constructed to measure five major categories of response of interest to the researchers. These categories included: 1) information about the editorial functions and roles of the academic gatekeeper, 2) information about the staffing and editorial policies of the publication, 3) measures of the subject's attitudes toward various suggested policies, criteria for manuscript acceptance, and standards for journals; 4) the philosophical orientations of academic journal gatekeepers, and 5) data on demographic characteristics. The questionnaire consisted of both structured and unstructured questions, the structured questions being primarily series of Likert-type rating scales. This preliminary questionnaire was pretested on academic colleagues in the School of Education at The Ohio State University to assess comprehensiveness and ease of response, and on various faculty throughout the university with specialized knowledge of questionnaire and scaling techniques to determine if question wording, placement, and construction corresponded with accepted scientific survey practices. After minor modifications suggested by these pretest audiences, the instrument and mail survey techniques were considered ready to be more thoroughly pretested in an exploratory pilot study.

Pilot Study Pretest

The pilot study enabled the researchers to evaluate the questionnaire and mailing procedures under real-life conditions with sample respondents similar to those selected in the actual data collection phase of the research. The pretest sample was chosen by randomly selecting journals from Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory [Education Section] (14th edition). The principals surveyed twenty-five editors, chosen so as not to deplete seriously the available publications for the actual survey. Therefore, in addition to some journals similar to those in the study, the pilot included disciplinary-oriented publications [e.g., College English, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education] and denominational publications [Jewish Education, Today's Catholic Teacher], types which were not included in the actual study. Each editor of the pretest journals was mailed (1) a copy of the preliminary questionnaire, (2) a cover letter explaining the purposes of the project, and (3) a form for his written evaluations of the questionnaire and the research in general.

Results of Pilot Study

The results of the pilot study indicated a number of changes would be necessary both in the format of the questionnaire and in some of the procedures and concepts of the general research. Most important was the realization it would be infeasible to include a sampling of editorial board members of the academic journals as first proposed. The pretest results made it apparent no pattern of editorial board composition or size existed across the journals sampled. Some editorial boards were described as closely knit, "in-house" structures of three or four individuals while other journals reported they had working boards of many members scattered across the country with varying functions and roles. It was therefore decided by the researchers to restructure sections of the questionnaire to gather more descriptive information about the size, composition, and functions of such editorial boards in order to provide a data base for future in-depth studies of these groups. With the exception of this change and a number of small corrections in question wording, however, the problems revealed by the pilot study were considered minor and it was decided that the main data gathering phase of the research could begin.

Main Data Gathering Procedures

The mail survey techniques utilized in the first phase of the main data-gathering process, the field survey, included the following:

1. Advance notification
2. Cover letter with letterhead, personalized salutation, handwritten signature, use of title, hand written postscript
3. Return, postage-paid envelopes
4. Use of postage stamps - first class mail
5. Postcard first follow-ups
6. Complete second mailing to non-respondents
7. Use of premium
8. Telephone, and additional mailing, third follow-up

The final questionnaire was commercially printed on "eye-saver" green paper for distinctiveness. The population of journals for the research was taken from 1973-74 Ulrich's International Periodicals

Directory (15th Edition) (Education Section) which was obtained in preprint form from the publisher to provide the most up-to-date, complete list available of such publications. An analysis of the population source revealed that, based on selection criteria developed by the researchers, it would be feasible to include the entire population of such journals in the study rather than to draw a sample. The criteria for inclusion were: 1) that the publication be monthly, semi-annual, or annual; 2) that it not be international in scope; 3) that it not be subject-matter oriented but rather addressed to the broad area of education in general; 4) that it not be lower than state level in terms of the publication sponsor (e.g., no county or city publications) and 5) that it be printed as a magazine or journal rather than in a newspaper or tabloid format.

These criteria were selected by the researchers to limit the study to those publications corresponding most to the journal concept, omitting newsletters, bulletins, or information sheets. It was determined that 248 journals in the periodical guide fit these qualifications and all were included in the study. It should be noted at this juncture that the researchers did make two deviations from these criteria. It was unfeasible to include all audio-visual and continuing education journals in the population because of the vast number of publications in these fields. It was therefore decided to include all the principal journals in these fields (i.e., those published by major organizations and/or associations as well as those generally recognized as major publications by sources in the areas). Care was taken to insure the overall results of this study were not unduly influenced by the inclusion of these journals.

Second, we found some journals published by educational associations which had natural "counterparts." For example, a state education department publication might have the same teacher readership and be competitive with a union publication which was called a journal, contained feature articles, but was printed in tabloid. A small number of these publications were retained for data analysis to allow us to mirror the field more adequately.

The mailing procedures were carried out following a structured schedule which called for completion of the field survey within a ten week period.

It is difficult to establish an exact response rate. The principals used the latest journal listing, which included editors' addresses. Yet, a number of journals in the population were no longer being published; some addresses were inaccurate and forwarding was impossible; a few journals which were listed in the education section of the directory were found to be outside the field (e.g., for group trainers); others had recently converted to tabloid from the more traditional journal publishing format; a number were in-house publications either of entrenprenurial or of public agencies in education and some did not publish new material but summarized existing literature.

We do not include the twenty-five journals excluded for reasons cited above in our non-response rate. Further, we add to the usable response rate of 130, thirteen journals whose editors completed only small sections of the instrument and two journals edited by individuals editing two journals each. We counted the responses once in our analysis. The response rate is calculated from the ratio of 145/223 or 65%.

It should be noted that a number of editors sent us copies of their journals and letters referring to the survey they had completed, but the instrument was not included in the envelope. Further, it is of interest that fifteen editors who we attempted to locate by telephone for our third follow-up did not have a telephone listing. Many of these journals may no longer be published even though the editor may have received the survey materials.

There were very few journal editors who did not respond to our research project in some way, few who simply refused to return material, even it if seemed inappropriate or was returned incomplete.

Considering the research was conducted on the entire population of education journals as we defined them, the response was considered satisfactory for the purposes of the research.

Field Case Study

The case study phase of the research was conducted after the completion and preliminary analysis of the field survey responses. The principals placed each returned survey in one of four categories whose parameters are described below. We labelled these categories: research, scholarly, professional, and association journals.

It was decided to conduct in-depth interviews with two journal editors in each of these categories to supplement the data from the field surveys. The eight journals for actual analysis were selected based on the completeness of responses to the survey questionnaire, an analysis of the materials included in their publications, and the editors' willingness to participate in the continuation of the study. Obviously, based on these criteria, the eight journals are in no way representative of the journals in the population and the researchers have been careful to interpret data from the case studies only as they relate to the journals studied or as possible illustrative material where the data from the field survey and the case-studies overlap in such a way that to so proceed does not stretch the interpretation. The interviews were conducted in day-long sessions at seven journal offices located in eastern and midwestern sections of the country. In addition to the interviews, the researchers attained policy statements, examples of correspondence, and other similar documents when available. The final interview was conducted by long-distance conference telephone call with a subject with offices in the San Francisco, California area.

Journal Categories

In the research proposal submitted for funding we hypothesized there was a range of journals in education which could be categorized within a paradigm structured by two major variables: a journal's substantive orientation (whether it was data or issue oriented) and the methodology employed (whether it was empirical or non-empirical).

We suggested the interaction of these variables would allow for the identification of the following journal types.

Category I - Data/Empirical: Research journals publishing disciplinary oriented research material using qualitative, quantitative or historical methodologies.

Category II - Issue/Empirical: Action research journals drawing implications for practice from qualitative and quantitative research studies.

Category III - Data/Non-empirical: Urbane journals publishing articles based on the perceptions of sensitive observers of the social or educational scene whose less rigorous, personal, but scholarly approach are the foci of articles.

Category IV - Issue/Non-empirical: Viewpoint journals publishing highly opinionated papers based on judgments formed from the authors' values or assumptions.

We suggested there were process differences associated with each of these types, from the involvement of editorial board members as readers of papers submitted for publication, to acceptance rates and the nature of the feedback received by authors whose work was found to be unacceptable.

The basic framework provided considerable help in allowing us to meaningfully organize the selection of journals to be surveyed and the incoming data. However, we did modify the paradigm slightly in the process of the research project.

It should be noted that many journals are not of one piece. A research journal may have a section of commentary, or more likely, an urbane journal might contain some research articles or a research section. We relied on the incoming surveys before categorizing journals and in addition to the editors' data examined copies of the publications which were requested in our instructions to respondents. By carefully considering reaction to a number of questions in the survey which delineated specific journal's purposes, the data base used by authors, and the methodologies employed in conjunction with the physical examination of a copy of the publication in a majority of cases, we categorized the publication. Given the presence of some conflicting data on the survey or a journal which was sectioned we made as accurate a placement as possible by examining the evidence in total and in the context of the one hundred and thirty responses ~~in~~ our possession.

Three judges (the two principal investigators and a graduate associate) placed the publications. The placement was not accomplished independently given the need to discuss the multiple data and to resolve the emerging issues (e.g., conflicting data). The majority of placements were easily made. Twenty percent required considerable discussion, and in some cases where physical evidence did not accompany surveys, we obtained copies to be confident of the categorization.

The paradigm, a heuristic device, sensitized the judges. We did re-label the journals in our respondent group to better reflect the divergencies which emerged.

Category I - Research Journals. This category is similar to the earlier one noted in the proposal. These journals publish "straight" research pieces whose relevance to education is based on their attention to researchable topics in the field. The articles may well have implications for practice but these are not highlighted. Prominent are the methodological considerations and data manipulations by the author. A physical presence, a stylistic reality, including figures, tables, bibliographies, sensitizes the reader to the material's orientation. (N = 12)

Category II - Scholarly Journals. This category is similar to the action research designation made earlier. These publications combined empirically derived data generated by traditional methodologies with a clearer relationship to practical or topical issues in education. A greater balance existed between substantive development of the paper and its larger meaning. We included in this section those journals initially classified as urbane. We believed their scholarly focus, one generated by more qualitative methods, should allow for such placement. (N = 37)

Category III - Professional Journals publish articles focusing on topics with immediate utility: papers which merely use data to speak to professional issues and needs. The implications of a situation or professionally oriented recommendations for practice are highlighted. They speak to readers who have immediate contemporary concerns focusing on practice, and opinions and recommendations are the bill of fare. Whereas research journals focus on the data collection and manipulation processes and scholarly journals carefully balance the substantive and the implications of papers, professional journals are more to the right because of their greater emphasis on implications for practice. The practice of education is the focus. (N = 37)

Category IV - Association Journals are clearly house organs for their publishers. Though research, scholarly, and professional journals might be published by associations and may speak to their interests, these journals are more mundane in servicing those interests. Calendars of upcoming events, columns by association executives, conference highlights predominate. Additionally, these publications include articles which are either commissioned or which come from the field. Clearly, this publication has a "party line" and services the association's needs to inform the members of its activities and priorities. (N = 23)

CHAPTER 3

EDITORS AND THEIR PUBLICATIONS

The first section of the survey addressed both the editors' previous and current professional roles relating to the gatekeeping function as well as their other activities. To conduct the assessment, it sought to determine (1) when editors assumed their editorship; (2) if they had previously served on the board or as "reader" of their journal; (3) with what other journals they had served in an editorial capacity; (4) by what process they were chosen as editors; (5) the length of term each served and if this were renewable; (6) the percentage of time devoted to the editorial role and other role positions assumed by each editor; (7) the percentage of time devoted to specifically delineated editorial functions (e.g., manuscript reading, managing the editorial office, developing policy for publication).

Tenure

In analyzing when editors assumed their present editorship, this report focused on editors who had served for 1-10 years. These individuals represented 87% of the total respondents. (To facilitate analysis, the data that follows, however, interpolates the 113 respondents or 87% of the editors to be equal to 100% of the respondents since the total range for the study (1-54 years) is unwieldy.)

Of the 113 editors who served in editorial capacities for less than or equal to 10 years, 92 editors or 81% served as editors for 1-5 years. After five years of service, a significant decrease occurs in the number of editors who continue in their positions. An average of 4% of the editors continue in their positions each subsequent year.

It is worthwhile to note the differences in the time editors remain in their respective positions with their journals. On the research-scholarly-professional-association journal continuum (R-S-P-A) an upward progression from research to association editorship occurs in the time periods editors retain their positions. Ninety percent of the research journal editors have left their positions after five years. A substantial number of research editors leave their editorship at the end of their fourth year. Of the 81% who remain through their fourth year of editorship, only 10% continue into and complete their fifth year.

As we move along the continuum, the number of years an editor remains in his position increases as the rigor of the journal's content decreases. Among editors of scholarly journals, 91% (or 29 of the 32 reporting in the period of ten years or less) remain through their sixth year. Similarly, 89% of the professional journal editors continue through their sixth year. In contrast to editors of other journals, however, these editors have a consistent decline in the number remaining through their tenth year.

Editors of association journals show less decrease in length of service than do editors in any other category on the continuum. Eighty-nine percent of association journal editors continue through their eighth year. Additionally, this category has one other point of interest. Twenty-five percent of association journal editors assumed their editorship for five years. This figure represents an 11% increase from fourth year in the continuance of an individual in the editorial role, yet continuance through the sixth year shows an 11% decrease. Overall, editors of association journals continue to serve in their editorial capacities longer than do editors of other journals, and this discrepancy is most strongly demonstrated when one contrasts association journal editors with editors of research and scholarly publications. (See Table 1, Editors' Tenure, Page 17.)

Previous Service - Current Journal

Editors were asked if they had previously served as a member of the editorial board or had been a reader of the journal where they were currently editor. The data indicate that 71% or 92 editors had no prior service on the boards or as readers of their journals.

There was a progressive decline in the number of editors who had served on boards. Research journals had the highest percentage (58%) of editors who had served on boards or as readers. In contrast, 46% of scholarly journal editors, 19% of professional journal editors, and 13% of association journal editors had this previous board experience.

These data imply that the more scholarly and technically rigorous journals (i.e., research and scholarly journals) frequently demand their editors have more direct knowledge of the content processes and goals of the journal prior to assuming editorship. Further, prior service in addition to serving a socialization function provides opportunities for both the editor and those who appoint him to assess interest and adequacy for the position. Editors of professional and associational journals learn about their media after assuming responsibility for its progress.

Our interviews suggest professional and association editors are likely to be involved in major reorganizations of their journals. Just as socialization through prior experience may be functional for editors of the more rigorous publications within a scholarship tradition, so it may be functional for professional and associational gatekeepers to have an absence of prior cognitive and affective commitments to meet emerging needs of the field through the journals represented.

TABLE 1

Editors' Tenure

	Total		R		S		P		A	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 gr %	22	19.5	2	20	10	31.3	8	15.4	2	10.5
2	18	15.9	1	10	6	18.8	10	19.2	1	5.3
3	15	13.3	3	30	2	6.3	8	15.4	2	10.5
4	20	17.7	2	20	4	12.5	12	23.1	2	10.5
5	17	15.0	1	10	5	15.6	6	11.5	5	26.3
6	6	5.3	--	--	2	6.3	2	3.3	2	10.5
7	4	3.5	--	--	1	3.1	2	3.8	1	5.3
8	4	3.5	1	10	--	--	1	1.9	2	10.5
9	4	3.5	--	--	2	6.3	1	1.9	1	5.3
10	3	2.7	--	--	--	--	2	3.8	1	5.3
Cum % ten years	113	100	10	100	32	100	52	100	19	100

Previous Service - Other Journals

The study assessed editors previous association with other journals. We sought data to determine (1) the number of journals with which they had experience; (2) the capacities in which they had served on these journals (e.g., editor, reader); (3) the number of years they had served in editorial capacities on other journals.

The data indicate that 66% or 86 of the respondents had no previous experience with other journals. Editors having experience most often had it with 1-2 journals. Twenty-four editors (19%) reported having experience with one other journal and 15 or 12% had experience with two journals. Five respondents (4%) had experience with 3-5 journals. None had experience with more than five journals.

Interestingly, research journal editors (42%) had significantly more previous experience (e.g., editor, reader) than did editors of other journals. Additionally, 25% of these editors had experience with two other journals, while 58% had no experience.

In scholarly, professional, and association journals, the percentages of editors who had no previous experience ranged from 66% (professional) to 70% (association). In both scholarly and professional journals, 32% of the editors had 1-3 years previous experience. The majority (26%) of association journal editors had had experience with only one other journal. (See Table 2, Previous Service - Other Journals, Page 19.)

These findings illustrate again that editors of research journals have considerably more previous experience than do editors of the other journals. Yet it is also noteworthy that although they possess more previous experience, their experiences have not been in editorships. One third of the editors of research journals, however, had served either on editorial/advisory boards or as "readers."

Cumulatively, 17% or 22 of the respondents had prior experience as editors. Background as an editor predominated among editors of scholarly journals (24%). Editors of professional journals and editors of association journals (17%) also had previous service as editors.

Among professional editors with previous experience, 7 or 12% had been assistant/associate editors. This is a considerably higher percentage than experienced by editors in any of the other three journal areas. With the exception of editors of research journals, the general trend is for the majority of editors to have previous experience as either editors or assistant/associate editors.

Finally, the editors of research, scholarly, and association journals most often served in their previous editorial functions for periods of 2-5 years. The average time for this service was three years. Scholarly journal editors commenced and terminated previous editorial functions sooner than did research and association journal editors. In

TABLE 2

Previous Service - Other Journals

Number of Journals with Which Editors Have Experience	No.	%	R No.	R %	S No.	S %	P No.	P %	A No.	A %
0	86	66.2	7	58.3	25	67.6	38	65.5	16	69.6
1	24	18.5	2	16.7	7	18.9	9	15.5	6	26.1
2	15	11.5	3	25.0	3	8.1	9	15.5		
3	3	2.3			2	5.4	1	1.7	1	4.3
4	1	0.8								
5	1	0.8					1	1.7		

contrast, editors of professional journals have a wide and fairly equal distribution of prior editorial responsibilities. This service ranges from 1-20 years.

Process of Choosing Editor

The study sought to determine how editors of the various journals were chosen. Statistics revealed the process of choosing a journal editor is primarily completed (1) by the previous editor; (2) by the president or executive committee of the professional organization; (3) by the commercial publisher of the journal; or (4) because it is part of the professional association's responsibilities. Choice by the previous editor is most prevalent in research journals. The importance of selection by the previous editor progressively diminishes in significance as movement to journals requiring less technical - scholarly rigor occurs. Influence by the president or executive committee of the organization plays the most significant role in the selection of editor in each of the four journal categories. The commercial publisher has considerable impact on the choice of editor particularly in research and professional journals. Additionally, in research journals the publications committee of a professional organization and the editorial board have significant input into the editor selection process. These two agents have some importance in the selection process of scholarly journals, but are insignificant in the selection process of professional and association journals.

Finally, unlike editors of research, scholarly, and professional journals, 65% of the editors of association journals serve because it is a responsibility of their function in the professional organization. This is of particular interest since it illustrates that the editors of association journals have multiple role job descriptions of which the position of editor is but a portion. The interviews we conducted with two editors of association journals also substantiate their multiple roles.

Length of Term

The study sought data to determine (1) the length of term served by editors and (2) if terms were renewable.

The majority of respondents, 84 or 65%, report their term of appointment as editor is undefined in years. Where length of editorial term is defined, editors of research and scholarly journals have terms which average three years. The range of these defined terms is from 1-4 years. Editors of professional journals, however, have specified terms ranging from one to six years. In contrast, associational publication editors, with specified appointments, consistently hold 4 and 5 year terms. This editorial group reports no appointments of 1-3 or 6 years.

Finally, only 2 percent of the population indicated that their terms were not renewable. Terms of all research editors were renewable, or they did not have term appointments; and 5 percent of the scholarly editors were not able to be reappointed. The data suggest that turnover is not a function of term expiration.

Percent Total Time as Editor and Other Role Positions

The study also assessed (1) the percentage of time editors devoted to editorial roles and (2) the additional roles editors assumed if they devoted less than 100 percent of their time to the editorial task.

1. Time Devoted to Editorial Functions

The combined percentages of time spent on the editorial role by editors in each category provides but a partial picture of the actual time each group devoted to this function. The composite data revealed that cumulatively, thirty-nine editors or 30% of the 130 respondents spent 16-20% of their professional time strictly on editorial functions; fifty-three editors or 41% spent 21-25% of their time on these functions; sixty-nine editors or 53% of the respondents spent 36-40% of their time on editorial functions; eighty-eight or 68% of the editors spent 41-50% of their time in this capacity; and 124 or 95% of the editors of the four categories of journals spent 76-100% of their time devoted to editorial roles. The remaining 5% of the editors did not respond.

TABLE 3

Time - Editor's Role

% Time Editor Role	No.	Total %	Total %
1-5	10	7.7	17.7
6-10	17	13.1	20.8
11-15	4	3.1	23.9
16-20	8	6.3	30.2
21-25	11	8.5	38.7
26-30	3	2.3	41.0
31-35	9	6.9	47.9
36-40	7	5.4	53.3
41-50	19	14.6	67.9
51-60	6	4.6	72.5
61-75	8	6.2	78.7
76-100	22	16.9	95.4
No response	6	4.6	100

These data illustrate two interesting features: (1) approximately two-thirds (68%) of the editors spend only 50% (or less) of their total time primarily in the editorial role; (2) considerable discrepancy exists between the cumulative data for the total journal categories and the data for the individual journal categories; that is, an inverse relationship exists between the cumulative data first presented and the data for the respective journals. For example, a higher percentage of research editors spend a considerably smaller portion of their total time on editorial functions than do editors of association journals.

TABLE 4

Editor Roles: Research Editors

% Time Editor Role	No.	%	Total %
1-10	3	25.0	25.0
11-25	4	33.3	58.3
26-35	4	33.3	91.7
36-50	-	--	--
51-60	1	8.3	100
61-100	-	0	--

More specifically, 25 percent of the research editors devote 1-10 percent of their time to editorial roles; one third devote 11-25 percent of their time, one-third devote 26-35 percent of their time; the remaining 8 percent of the editors devote 51-60 percent of their time to editorial tasks. It is particularly noteworthy that more than 90% of these editors spend 35% or less of their professional time in editorial functions.

A comparison between editors of scholarly and research journals indicates a striking similarity between the percentages of time spent on editorial functions at the lower levels. Not until we reach 31-35% of the editors' time does a sharp discrepancy occur. Thus, when viewing cumulative data, we find from the outset that 24% of the scholarly journal editors devote 6-10% of their time to editorial functions; 35% devote 16-20% of their time; 49% devote 21-25% of their time; 62% devote 31-35% of their time; 87% devote 41-50% of their time; and the remaining 5% of reporting editors devote 61-100% of their time in editorial roles. Comparing these data with those of editors of research journals one finds that while nearly all editors of research journals spend 35% or less of their time on editorial functions, 30% of the scholarly journal editors spend between 35% and 50% of their time in this capacity.

There is a marked increase in the total percentage of time editors spend in the editor role when we study data from the professional journals. Although we find initial similarity between this category and the other two (i.e., 22% of the editors spend 6-10% of their time in the editorial role), this correspondence changes radically as we view successive distributions of the editors' time. We find that more than one third (35%) of the editors devote 21-25% of their time to the principal role of editor; 57% devote 41-50% of their time to this role; 60% of the editors devote 61-75% of their time; the remaining 25.9% of these editors devote 76-100% of their professional time to editorial functions.

Editors of association journals, however, devote the most substantial portion of their time to the editorial role. Because they spend far more time in this capacity than do the editors of the other three journal types, one cannot find even the initial similarities in percentages of editors and percentages of time devoted to editorial function that was found among the other journal types. While 22 or 25% of the editors of research, scholarly and professional journals devoted 6-10% of their time to the editorial role, we find that at the lowest level only 9% of association journal editors devote 1-5% of their time to this function. None of these editors, however, devote between 6-15% of their time to this role, and only 22% (a 13% increase from 9%) devote 16-20% of their time in an editorial role. A cumulative total of only 30% of these editors devote 31-35% of their time in editorial capacities; 52% devote 41-50% of their time; 74% devote 61-75% of their time; the remaining 26% devote 76-100% of their time to editorial functions. We do find that although a higher percentage of time is spent in editorial functions in the 51-100% range, a reasonably close correspondence does occur from this point (range does not exceed 5% at any time) between the percentages of time devoted to editorial tasks by the professional journal editors and the percentages of time devoted by association journal editors.

2. Other Roles Assumed by Editors

After determining the percent of total time editors devoted strictly to editorial responsibilities, the study also assessed the additional roles editors assumed. It sought information about (1) the number of editors assuming one additional role, (2) the number of editors assuming two additional roles, and (3) the number of editors who assumed specific roles (e.g., professor/teacher, administrator, student).

Analysis of the data reveals that 83% or 110 editors assume one additional role; 17% or 23 editors assume two additional roles. These data indicate that of the 110 editors who assumed one or more additional roles, 43 or 33% were also professors/faculty members; 42 or 32% served in administrative capacities for the professional agency or association; 5 or 4% were also administrators in governmental agencies; 17 or 13% were also school administrators; 8 or 6% were administrators in firms; 1 or .76% was a student; 16 or 13% designated "other" roles in addition to their editorship which are not included in these categories.

The following chart delineates the percentages of editors of the respective journals who had one or more roles:

TABLE 5

Editors: One or More Roles

	R	S	P	A
One other role	91.7	86.5	81.0	86.9
Two other roles	15.4	27.1	13.8	13.4

The most prominent functions assumed by the editors of the respective journals are indicated in the percentage chart below:

TABLE 6

Editors: Major Roles

	R %	S %	P %	A %
Professor/Faculty Member	69	40	27	9
Administration (Prof Agency or Assn)	8	17	45	39
Admin. in School Institution	15	26	7	0
Admin. in Firm	8	5	9	0
Other	0	12	9	30

One should not overlook that these percentages do not illustrate all of the additional roles assumed by editors, but only the most prominent roles assumed by the majority of editors. It should also be noted that 22% of the editors of association journals assume additional roles as administrators in government agencies. This is the only editorial group to assume this function.

In reviewing the table above one should note the decreasing importance the role of professor/faculty member plays as one moves from editors of research journals to editors of association journals. Conversely, the increasing significance of administration in professional agencies and association should be noted. The former suggests the reason why 92% of research journal editors and 62% of scholarly journal editors spend 31-35% of their total time devoted strictly to editorial functions while, in contrast, only 36% of professional journal editors and 30% of association journal editors spend this limited portion of time in editorial responsibilities.

Given the relatively high percentage of association and professional editors who have one or more additional roles and who spend a considerable percentage of their time in their function as editor, the data might suggest vastly overworked individuals. In fact, many professional and association editors serve broad information dissemination functions in organizations and describe themselves as editors with regard to their total activities. There is less discontinuity between the multiple responsibilities of editors of association and professional journals and many, when defining their responsibilities, refer to them as undifferentiated, except as defined by the type of information they are disseminating.

Time Devoted to Specific Editorial Duties

The study assessed the amounts of time editors spend completing the following editorial duties: (1) reading manuscripts; (2) corresponding and working with authors; (3) communicating with editorial boards; (4) managing the editorial office; (5) working on business concerns; (6) developing policy; (7) copy editing; (8) writing copy; (9) design and lay out. The cumulative data of four journal categories are used to illustrate the broad time areas where editors spend significant portions of time. More important perhaps than these data are the individual journal data for the nine classifications listed above. Study of these data shows striking divergencies and inverse relationships among the journal types in the amount of time each editor spends on a particular function.

For simplification, both the combined and individual data for the journal categories will be discussed by focusing on the cumulative percentages of time editors spend on a particular function; that is the analysis will focus primarily on combined time periods whenever applicable rather than on individual time periods. It should also be noted that these combined time periods may vary somewhat among the journal categories. Thus analysis focuses on the primary time areas where editors spend their time on a particular duty.

Analysis of the cumulative data from the four journal classifications allows us to make some general statements about the duties of editors. The gross data reveal the following:

(1) In general editors spend more time reading manuscripts than they do performing any other duty (twenty-eight percent spend 1-10% of their time; 15% (cumulatively 46%) spend 16-20% of their time; 12% (cumulatively 58%) spend 21-25% of their time; and 11% (cumulatively 75%) spend 30-40% of their time reading manuscripts).

(2) In the categories of (a) corresponding with authors; (b) communicating with editorial boards; (c) managing the editorial office; (d) working on business concerns, an average of 27% of the editors do not perform these duties. Of those editors who do perform these functions an average of 51% spend between 1-10% of their time in these capacities; nearly two-thirds ($\bar{m} = 64\%$) spend from 1-20% of their time on these tasks.

(3) Although 22% of the editors responded they spent no time in copy editing, 29% spend between 1-10% of their time in this function. A larger number of editors spend more time copy editing than they do in the tasks cited above. Thus, only 55% of the editors spend 1-20% of their time completing the preceding functions.

(4) Editors are not generally involved in writing copy or in design and lay out. Sixty-two percent report they spend no time writing copy and 66% report they spend no time in design and lay out. Of those editors who spend time writing copy 16% spend 1-10% of their time in this function. The amount of time spent on this function by the remaining 20% of editors has a wide distribution ranging from 11-100% of their total time. In contrast, while nearly the same number of editors are uninvolved in these two functions, the 44% of the editors who are involved in design and lay out spend only 1-5% of their time in this function. One might assume their staffs perform the major portions of these two functions.

It is perhaps more useful, however, to study the individual amounts of time editors of the four journals spend in these nine duties. Here we discover sharp differences among the categories.

A progressive decrease occurs between research, scholarly, professional and association journals in the number of editors and the amounts of time each spends reading manuscripts. Two thirds (67%) of the editors of research journals spend 26-75% of their time reading manuscripts; 46% of scholarly journal editors spend this same amount of time; 65% of these editors spend 21-75% of their time in this way.

In contrast, 66% of professional journal editors spend 1-25% of their time reading manuscripts. Of significance here is that 36% of these editors spend 1-10% of their time reading manuscripts and 29% spend

16-25% of their time in this function. Similarly, but showing still a more decided decrease, 39% of association journal editors spend 1-10% of their time reading manuscripts and 26% spend 16-20% of their time in this pursuit; most importantly 78% of these editors spend 1-25% of their time reading manuscripts.

These data suggest the more scholarly and technically rigorous the journal the more time the editor spends reading manuscripts; the less scholarly and technically rigorous, the less time he spends. Subsequent data will lend credence to this argument and will also suggest that, in particular, editors of research journals devote less time to business/managerial duties than do editors of scholarly, professional and association journals.

A high correspondence occurs between the amounts of time editors of research and editors of scholarly journals spend corresponding and working with authors. Approximately 30% of these editors spend only 1-10% of their time in this function. Additionally, these editors devote significantly more time to this task; 33% of the research journal editors spend 21-30% of their time with authors (none spend 16-20% of their time) and 51% of scholarly journal editors spend 16-20% of their time corresponding and working with authors.

An inverse relationship exists between the amount of time editors of research and scholarly journals spend on these duties and the amount of time editors of professional and association journals spend. Fifty percent of professional journal editors and 61% of association journal editors spend 1-10% of their time corresponding and working with authors, and 74% of professional spend 1-20% of their time in this way. Significantly, 26% of association journal editors report spending no time in this function. Journals are either staffed by salaried writers who write and edit the materials in-house or these editors simply perform a limited educative function for prospective authors who submit manuscripts for consideration.

Decided differences exist among the various categories of editors and their respective communication with editorial boards. Data indicate that there is a progressive decrease in an editor's communication with the editorial board as one moves from R journals to A journals. Eighty-three (83%) percent of research journal editors spend 1-10% of their time with editorial boards; 54% of scholarly journal editors and 52% of professional journal editors spend 1-10% of their time; 13% of association journal editors spend 1-5% of their time communicating with editorial boards (none spend 6-10% of their time in this capacity). It is also noteworthy that 8% of the research journal editors, 22% of the scholarly journal editors, 41% of the professional journal editors, and 83% of the association journal editors report spending no time communicating with editorial boards. This may occur for several reasons (1) research and scholarly journals receive more unsolicited manuscripts and hence must have more "readers" with whom the editor must communicate; (2) research and scholarly journals lack a salaried staff characteristic of association journals, hence they must spend more time discussing and procuring manuscripts with editorial boards. Conversely the association journal staff often assumes many of these functions. (3) Association journals generally do not have editorial boards per se, or readers since their work is done "in-house," hence the high percentage of association journal editors who spend no time with editorial boards.

Again, a decided difference occurs between the four categories of journals in the amount of time their respective editors spend managing the editorial office. One third of the editors of research journals and 38% of the scholarly editors report spending no time managing the editorial office. In contrast, approximately one quarter of professional (24%) and association (26%) journal editors report no responsibility for office management. Yet it is more important to review the amounts of time editors of the respective journals do spend managing the editorial office, for here we find a striking disparity between research journal editors and the other three categories of editors. The remaining two-thirds of the research journal editors spend only 1-10% of their time managing the office. This high percentage of editors who devote such a limited amount of their time to this function may be caused by the large number of editors who have professional commitments in addition to the editorship. Hence these individuals may devote what time they have for the editorship to reading manuscripts for technical accuracy and scholarly content.

In contrast, approximately 45% of the editors in the other three categories spend 1-10% of their time managing the office. The remaining editors (S = 16%; P = 29%, A = 39%) spend more than 10% of their time in office management. In general, there is a wide time range among editors of scholarly and professional journals who spend in excess of 10% of their time in management. However, 35% of the editors of association journals spend 11-20% of their time in management and of this figure 26% spend 16-20% of their time in this capacity. The fairly low amount of time spent by more than two thirds (69.5%) of the association journal editors may possibly be attributed to better run office staffs and/or to other functions the editors must assume in the professional association or agency.

Among the editors who do devote time to business concerns there is a fair amount of consistency. At least 50% of the editors of research, scholarly and professional journals spend 1-10% of their time in this capacity. (It should be noted that no research journal editors spend 6-10% of their time on business concerns.) The range distribution of how much time editors spend on this duty becomes greater as one moves from research to professional journals. Although the editors of the association journals have a range of 1-25% of their time devoted to business concerns, a significantly smaller distribution than found in scholarly and professional journals, it is noteworthy that only 43% of association journal editors devote 1-10% of their time to business concerns, with a cumulative total of 61% devoting 1-25% of their time to this endeavor.

Not surprisingly, a progressive decrease occurs from editors of research journals to editors of association journals in the amount of time each editor spends on developing journal policy.

TABLE 7

Editors: Policy Development

Policy: % Time Editor	R	S	P	A
0%	25	14	21	61
1-5%	67	41	42	17
6-10%	8	32	19	22

What is surprising is the low percentage of time many of the editors devote to this task. These figures thus suggest that especially in R, S, and P journals policy decisions are made most often without specific design and perhaps by oversight. Perhaps, there are few policy decisions to be made. One might conclude from the data on association journal editors, that here policy is determined by the professional association or agency and that the editor has little input into policy. This is particularly illustrated by the 61% of association journal editors who report no involvement with policy development.

Considerable disparity exists among the editors and the amounts of time each spends copy editing. As we move from R to A journal editors we find an increasing number of editors devoting substantially more time to this duty. Hence, although we find 42% of R journal editors, 27% of S journal editors, 19% of P journal editors, and 13% of A journal editors uninvolved in copy editing, we also note gross increases in the respective time each editor type devotes to the function (i.e., 32% of R journal editors devote 1-20% of their time; 62% of S journal editors devote 1-25% of their time; 57% of P journal editors devote 1-25% of their time, yet 81% devote 1-75% of their time to copy editing; most dramatically, 48% of A journal editors devote 31-100% of their time to this task. Thus, we conclude that as the scholarly and technical rigor of articles decreases from R to A journals, the amount of time the editors of each journal classification must devote to solely technical revision increases.

We find a similar pattern among the editors when we study the percentages of time each devotes to writing copy. Ninety-two percent of R journal editors and 70% of S journal editors devote no time to this task. In contrast only 59% of P journal editors and 39% of A journal editors devote no time. Of those editors who do devote time to this function, 24% S journal editors spend 1-10% of their time; 41% of P journal editors spend 1-50% of their time; the majority (48%) of A journal editors spend 31-100% of their time in writing copy. Again we note that this latter group of editors is essentially involved in technical operations of the journal, and that they rely more heavily on their staffs for editorial revisions than do editors of the other journal types.

Finally we find that few editors assume responsibility for design and layout of their journals.

TABLE 8

Editors: Design and Lay Out

Design and Lay Out: % Time Editor	R	S	P	A
0%	92	81	62	39
1-5%	8	19	38	61

This task is assumed by the publisher in the majority of research, scholarly, and professional journals and essentially by the staff and publisher in association journals, although more association journal editors (61%) do spend 1-5% of their time in this capacity.

CHAPTER 4

PRODUCTION

Two dimensions of the journal publication "production" process received our study. Editorial board members and readers of papers (who may not have a permanent appointment on an official board) assist many editors in their work. Additionally, managing editors and office staff assist editors in the more mundane matters, but at times this assistance has substantive implications.

Editorial Board Members

We requested respondents to indicate (1) the selection process of editorial boards; (2) the criteria used in choosing the persons to serve; (3) the functions of the boards; (4) the frequency and length of time of board meetings.

Our survey was constructed in such a way that editors skipped the section referring to the editorial board if they did not have one. The authors do not know how many individuals avoided answering questions in this section even though there was Board representation. We can only estimate that 100% of the research (1-2) 78% of the scholarly, 50% of the professional, and 13% of the associational publications have editorial boards. The stronger the tie to a literature base the more likely the publication will use permanent external consultants. The data suggest a definition of greater self sufficiency the more operational the interests of the editor or publisher. How, in fact, are editorial board members selected?

The data indicate that the two primary methods of selection to journals' editorial boards is through the action of the executive leadership of the publisher or the editor after nomination by a variety of procedures. The vast potential array of steps include recommendations by editor with appointment by a Dean or President; self nomination; nomination by departmental faculty; members of a professional association committee also serving as the editorial board, by consensus in an editorial staff, as examples. Editors seem to have relatively more appointment authority the more scholarly the publication. Of interest is the lack of input of journal readerships or the members of the associations which publish the media. If editorial board members in some sense are representative of readers' interests then their impacts are not being made either directly through election or indirectly through election after nomination by a professional association body. In fact in only three cases are there direct appointments by publication committees. Though in a few cases, nominations do come from the field, or from a variety of sources within an association, the choices are made by the journal leadership.

TABLE 9

Selection of Editorial Board Members

	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Exec Leadership of Assn.	38	29	5	42	16	43	15	26	2	9
Editor	38	29	10	83	17	46	11	19	--	
Prof. Assn. Nom. Members Elect	--		--		--		--		--	
Direct Appt Public Comm	3	2	1	8	--		2	3	--	
Direct Election by Assn. Members	--		--		--		--		--	
Editorial Board	5	4	2	17	3	8	--		--	
Advisory Board	1	1	--		1	3	--		--	
Other	14	11	--		8	22	5	9	1	4

What criteria do publishers and editors consider in their appointment decisions?

The appointers are interested in editorial board members who are as positively able to represent readers' interests as they are unconcerned that they be professors of education. Research journals want members who are specialists in areas of concern typically represented in the manuscripts submitted, a decreasing interest from research to association publications. On the other hand, there is an increasing interest in working within the framework of objectives established for the journal, and being a generalist in the field of education moving from research to association publications. The professional journals are more interested in personalistic criteria in comparison with the other categories of publications, even if ranked of low importance: professor of education, member of a minority group, representative of a geographic region of the country, and position of administrative leadership in the field. Research journals are less interested than scholarly publications that editorial board members represent schools of scholarly thought, (other disciplines whose members might be engaged in scholarship or education). Other data in this section suggest an interest in a wider knowledge base orientation on the part of scholarly publications.

Open-ended responses by editors to the criteria section, though few responded, indicate an interest in those who are willing to contribute time and effort to editorial duties.

We asked editors about the functions which editorial board members performed. Although in all categories they read and commented on manuscripts submitted, and recommended action on them to the editors, editorial board members of scholarly and professional publications have wider responsibilities when compared to those in the other categories.

Recommending and determining policy, involvement in financial and business decisions, advising on current developments in the field, managing content, supporting the editor, providing professional visibility, contributing manuscripts are functions performed more frequently by board members of scholarly and professional publications. Policy recommendation is the most important function in all but the research journals.

A number of items on our survey suggested final action: selecting manuscripts, determining policy and making financial and business decisions. The board members are more likely to have decision-making powers, in relation to "recommending" action, on manuscripts in professional publications, less in scholarly and the least in research. The same pattern is evident in policy recommendation or determination. Greater involvement in business affairs is prominent among professional journal board members.

The open-ended responses support the board range of functions for scholarly and professional publications. Suggesting theme topics, recommending authors for specific articles and providing feedback to editors on journal format were most common. Items frequently corresponded with categories listed in the survey question but provided more operational meaning, such as "assisting with problems ranging from a 'crooked' printer to brainstorming ideas," and "reviewing manuscripts not obviously appropriate to usual journal content."

It follows, given the functions board members of the respective journals perform, that there should be different schedules for board meetings. If they meet at all (four research, seven scholarly, and five professional boards do not), yearly meetings are most common, except among professional journals where a six month schedule is probable. Among the four categories, board members of professional publications are most likely to meet every two years.

Meetings usually last one day, although two day meetings are progressively more common in the scholarly and the professional categories, the latter category having three journals which meet for at least three consecutive days.

Comments of the editors reflect these differences. A research editor indicated they meet "occasionally for lunch or dinner when possible," and scholarly journal editors mentioned meeting "as changing needs of publication and readership demand," through there are two who met weekly and some who indicated "irregularly." Some professional journal editors indicate they hold meetings with subcommittees or individual board members throughout the year and/or after each issue is published. A number transact business over the phone or by mail.

The schedules of meetings result from the different, broader board functions as well as the increased proximity of members when we compare the national versus the regional character of publications in the four categories.

Staff

Journal production is a multi-faceted activity. Though our interest rests primarily in the more substantive activities of the editor, this person's role also deals with policy addressing production processes: a decline in the readership; printers' and the postal authorities' practices influence relations with publishers and financial viability. The press of activity, the large number of papers received for review and, frequently the "people networks" that must be managed, speak to the need for editorial assistance in the production process.

We asked the editors how many full-time equivalent staff worked with them. Forty-one percent of the publications are managed single handed, 31% have one and 17% have two, and 7% have three full-time equivalent staff. If editors have any assistance, not more than two others are involved. No research journal has more, but 5% of the scholarly, 14% of the professional, and 17% of the associational publications are

TABLE 10

Function of Editorial Board

	Total (t)		R			S			P			A		
	#	%		% t	% T		% t	% T		% t	% T		% t	% T
Read and Comment on Manuscripts	56	25.7	12	21.4	36.4	25	44.6	25.5	17	30.4	22.1	2	3.6	20
Recommend Action on Manuscripts	47	21.6	11	23.4	33.3	24	51.1	24.4	11	23.4	14.3	1	2.12	10
Select Ms.	18	8.3	1	5.6	3.0	9	50.0	9.2	7	38.9	9.1	1	5.6	10
Recommend Policy	57	26.1	8	14.0	24.2	26	45.6	26.5	20	35.1	25.9	3	5.3	30
Determine Policy	13	6.0	1	7.7	3.0	6	46.2	6.1	5	38.5	6.5	1	7.7	10
Make Fin. & Business Decisions	8	3.7	-	-	-	2	25.0	2.1	5	62.5	6.5	1	12.5	10
Advise on Current Developments	9	4.1	-	-	-	2	22.2	2.1	7	77.7	9.1	-	-	-
Managing Content (solicit., prioritize)	3	1.4	-	-	-	2	66.7	2.1	1	33.3	1.3	-	-	-
Support Editor	1	0.5	-	-	-	1	100.0	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Provide Professional Visibility	2	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	100.0	2.6	-	-	-
Contrib. Ms.	2	1.0	-	-	-	1	50.0	1.0	1	50.0	1.3	-	-	-
Other	2	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	1.3	1	50.0	10
Total (T)	N=218	100.0	N=33	-	100.0	N=98	-	100.0	N=77	-	100.0	N=10	-	100.0

so situated. In examining the data by type of publication, there is least support available to editors of research journals (50%), followed by association (48%), professional (41%) and scholarly media (35%).

We also requested information about managing editors and asked what functions they performed. There is a steady decline in the use of managing editors from research to association publications. As we move from the more substantive publications, the editor often performs the functions of a managing editor.

We differentiated these functions into two dimensions from the open-ended question on the survey instrument. As anticipated, most managing editors are engaged in copy-editing and printer relations; but we also found that some are involved in substantive matters, such as writing articles, or policy development. Of the seventy-two "functions" performed by managing editors, twelve fall into the latter areas and are more closely associated with scholarly and professional publications.

Interviews

A. Boards

Our interviews with eight editors further uncovered the nature of the working relationships between editors, their boards, "readers," and staff.

The limited involvement of board members and readers of research and scholarly publications was demonstrated in the interviews. Not only are highly specific inputs desired by editors, but with few exceptions, editors suggested external participants desired this degree of involvement. Manuscript reviewers may not learn of editorial decisions ultimately made by an editor who believes that "readers" do not want to be more extensively involved in the decision-making process. Their function is to provide an expert critique, and it is assumed they have limited interest in how these reactions are used.

Some publications whose board members were "representatives" of sections of an association would meet for one day sessions with the editor to react to policy concerns. Their involvement, however, was highly circumscribed, and the interviewers felt it to be ritualized.

Although editors want their decisions, both substantive and policy, to be based on "data" from other sources, by tradition and desire they function under the oft-quoted dictum, "the buck stops here." Though editors desire suggestions, there is no evidence that board members are perceived as having a close operational relationship to the publications and that they develop professionally through their affiliation with the media.

B. Staff

Of interest are the agency relationships of editors of journals which though of a "professional" or "associational" nature, are published by either a public or private educational organization.

The interviews suggest for the "associational" literature that clearances from superiors are obtained and that substantive content and associational goals with political-professional overtones, cannot be easily differentiated. Moving to the "professional" and "scholarly" media, the more substantive association based editors resist the notion that clearances are obtained. However, we find the editor, as an important principal in association activities, often the director of media, "knows" what is appropriate. Through briefings with leadership and through trust developed over the years he exercises freedom whose limits are apt not to be severely tested.

The principal investigators were made aware of the impact of office journal staff on editorial processes. For many editors the journal is but one facet of their total responsibilities. Their extraordinarily heavy work loads compel a number of them to utilize staff, in one case a secretary, to provide initial review of manuscripts. Staff reactions were either (1) explicitly written for the editor who would review them as he subsequently provided another check on the papers; or (2) an indication might occur, such as a cryptic note to the editor "asking" whether the manuscript should be immediately returned to the writer. The more "professional" the staff reviewers, the greater the use of discussion and the less resort to "indicators" in filing early reactions to a paper.

The influence of "staff" can be poorly understood by editors. An editor of a scholarly publication used university press personnel to manage segments of a journal, such as choosing photographs and the placement of articles, which have substantive implications. In reacting to the interview, the editor realized he allowed his assistants too much latitude.

Editors' use of board members, readers, and staff suggest a curious mixture of cosmopolitanism and localism. One "scholarly" editor has manuscripts reviewed by experts, each of whom is a faculty member in an elite college of education where he also has an appointment; an "association" editor must persuade practitioners in his state to write articles but uses his organization's chain of command to pass on the issues; a "professional" editor of an entreprenurial publication commissions papers from the field, but also "kills" them - paying the author a percentage of his original fee - if the paper is inadequate; another "professional" editor surveys contacts in each school district of a state concerning issues of importance that might be addressed in feature stories, but he includes his and his superior's priorities if they are not included among those from the field. In this case the staff priority, "black studies," allowed them to play an educative role; the belief autocracy cannot be enlightened is not evidenced by the data collected.

Reliance on support - for publishing and substantive needs, approval, image of collegiality, workload considerations - given various publishers' and editors' personalities is a highly complex matter. Each editor with whom we spoke believes his procedures are satisfactory given local considerations and the state of knowledge in the area represented in the publication. There is a conscious attempt to serve readers, contributors, publishers, and oneself. Although one might take issue with the patterns established by any one editor, each has developed complex relationships which "work." Editors, even in one research journal whose policy board was located in one university, seem to have created relationships associated with an internal-external mix modified by personal professional considerations.

Editors are dominant individuals who use many others in the production of the media. But, for the most part these relationships are "managed" with forethought and typically have proven very satisfactory to the incumbents.

Editor-Author Relationships

Editors make a number of policy decisions concerning the relationships between the journals and those whose papers are being considered for publication. Although editors do exercise "choice" this should not imply that policies are consciously developed and that decisions are made only after examinations of alternatives. In fact our interviews were judged to be successful, and the response rate to our lengthy survey was believed to be high primarily because editors were rationalizing and developing comprehension of processes not previously examined closely. One received the impression editors were as interested in the responses as were the principal investigators.

The actual survey question read: "We would like to learn what the publishing procedures are for your journal. Please indicate below whether the procedure described is followed by your journal by checking "Yes," "No," or Being considered."

We asked whether the journals' content consisted almost entirely of unsolicited as opposed to invited manuscripts. Except for the research category, there was congruency of results. Eight percent of the research editors (1) indicated the primary use of unsolicited material and fifty-seven percent of the scholarly and associational and fifty-five percent of the professional editors are primarily using invited work. Of course, this question only assessed the percentages of journals where the balance was shifted to invited work. Responses to another survey question suggest many more journals use invited material.

We asked editors in an open-ended question what methods they used to identify potential authors for manuscript invitations. Eight of the twelve research editors responded. For this category the editors primarily invited those "active in the field" (8), either through reputation or from knowledge gained through papers given at conferences. Mentioned half as often were recommendations by editorial boards or specialists (4).

Editors of scholarly journals rely considerably on recommendations by board members or specialists (19). They indicate activity in the field is the second most frequented mechanism (17). Typical responses are:

> "The issue editor is assumed to know the best possible contributors, but I suggest possibilities for his consideration also."
>
> "Persons recommended by specialists in specific curriculum areas."
>
> "Prior inquiry to find out what work they have been doing and the stature that work seems to have among the potential author's peers."

Another important dimension emerges for scholarly editors (13): personal contacts. This dimension is next to the highest for professional editors and also important for association gatekeepers. The following are responses to our query:

> "Word of mouth"
>
> "Personal contacts"
>
> "Personal acquaintances"
>
> "Direct acquaintance with people who have expertise in a specified area."

Although attendance at specific conference sessions is a method for selectively though not comprehensively determining who is working on interesting material, and one which first is screened by conference planning mechanisms, personal acquaintance smacks of greater chance and the intrusion of unacceptable criteria. It could be argued that as leaders in their fields, many editors are personally acquainted with leading scholars who can contribute knowledge to critical areas. Some interviews clearly suggest personal contacts are used both to discover an author's quality and to determine special issue topics.

Professional editors indicate the most important criterion is "active in field" -- "active" through conferences and previous publications as well as through the categories mentioned above. These responses are less elegant:

"No invitations issued to unknowns."

"Solicit from school systems."

"Watch for authors of new books on education."

"Material preparation 'farmed out' to University and College groups."

Association publication editors are twice as likely (10) to mention the category "active in field" than any other but, of course, in addition to or in lieu of substantive activity, that means high practitioner reputation. Typical responses were:

"Ask people who are doing good things to try to give us at least rough information."

"Personal contacts during school visits."

"Their letters and accomplishments."

Editors frequently mentioned more than one source of ideas for invitations. Thus, the numbers following the items represent not editors, but the frequency of the mechanism utilized.

Given a relatively prominent procedure of using some percentage of invited manuscripts, frequently at a high level, we can now examine other data which focus on author relationships.

We find all research editors (minus one non-respondent) have more than one reader review submitted manuscripts. This is true of ninety-two percent of scholarly editors, seventy-two percent of professional editors and twenty-six percent of association gatekeepers. In all but one research journal critiques are transmitted to the prospective authors. In contrast, thirty-eight percent of scholarly editors, fifty-seven percent of professional editors and seventy-four percent of association editors do not indicate why papers are found unacceptable.

It is understandable, then, that differential percentages of editors will use a "form" rejection letter. Twenty-five percent of the research editors use such a mechanism for feedback to authors. Difference between near unanimous feedback of critiques and more positive reaction to this item speaks to the probable practice of appending specific remarks on a sheet of paper attached to a form rejection. Thirty-eight percent of the scholarly editors use a form letter. This is true of thirty-three percent of professional and only twenty-two percent of association gatekeepers. It is possible that editors in the last category compose general rejections but do not include specifics. Perhaps this is an unwillingness to sound negative to potential authors who may also be members of the associations. One can always indicate how overly committed the publication is.

It is noteworthy that there is no correspondence between giving feedback to authors - in the form of reactions - and the editors' assumption of responsibility to assist authors in improving their work for all except research publications. Eighty-four percent of the scholarly editors believe they have an educational duty, one-third more than who return critiques; the same percentage of professional editors react positively but less than half return critiques, and sixty-one percent of association gatekeepers believe they have a helping function with one-fifth returning critiques. These functions can include, as well, helping to identify alternate publishing outlets and reacting to article ideas before submission.

Of course editors can argue they may have limited educational responsibilities. Supposedly journals publish their broad objectives and policies used in the review process and transmit to authors the criteria used in the operational evaluation of reviewed material. Thus, authors ought to know why their material is unacceptable.

However, two research editors (17%) do not publish their review policies, though one is considering changing this; forty-three percent of the scholarly editors fail to inform their prospective authors, with fourteen percent considering a change; sixty percent of professional journal editors do not inform their authors, while ten percent are considering change; sixty-one percent of association gatekeepers do not inform their readers. Overall, five percent more editors do not transmit actual criteria used in the decision process. The major category change occurs among research journals. Thirty-three percent do not inform authors of these criteria.

Although frequently prospective authors are unaware of the congruency of their paper with a journal's objectives and do not know, after submission, why their work was rejected, manuscript reviewers are apt to know the names of papers' authors and their institutional location. That is, papers are generally not read "blind" by forty-two percent of research journal, sixty-two percent of the scholarly journal, eighty-eight percent of the professional journal and eighty-three percent of associational reviewers.

In studying the position of readers, we also asked if the journal published articles by members of the editorial board. All research, eighty-one percent of the scholarly, fifty percent of the professional and thirteen percent of the associational gatekeepers did. The percentage differences speak somewhat to the differential roles of editorial board members.

There were a number of questions relating to the exchange of money between journals and authors. One question examined the exchange from the journal to the author for accepted contributions. No research journals, eight percent of the scholarly, seventeen percent of the professional, and thirteen percent of the associational "remunerate authors for accepted contributions."

Two questions examined author payment either for page charges to allow an article to appear earlier than originally scheduled or for the general publication of a paper accepted by a referee process. Less than four percent of the editors responded positively to these policy statements. Eight percent of the research editors charge a publication fee. Eight percent of the scholarly editors have page charges for early appearance and five percent bill for the publication of papers; three percent of the professional editors use these practices; while no association gatekeepers do.

Our last question spoke to the sequential arrangement of articles in journals; that is, whether they were published in chronological order as received, or grouped and published by topic area or other scheme. Two thirds of the research editors publish chronologically. In contrast eleven percent of the scholarly, twelve percent of the professional and none of the associational gatekeepers published chronologically. Topic oriented issues are common in educational publishing.

CHAPTER 5

PROCESSES RELATED TO MANUSCRIPT SELECTION

Many survey questions and much interview time was spent examining manuscript selection processes. In this section of the report we will detail data which addresses both broader and more specific factors of manuscript selection.

The Broader Context

Manuscript choice processes operate within a diffuse context, some of whose elements are more immediate to the purposes of a journal and its readership. Other parameters, such as editors' primary responsibility, are discussed in other sections of this report.

We classified each journal within one of four categories based upon a variety of indicators on the survey as well as factors presented through visual examination of the publications. Responses to our query, "Briefly describe the purpose of your journal," supported the classifications we designated for the journals. The responses to open-ended question were coded into six categories, with each journal's purposes coded for as many categories as were appropriate: association outlet, reportorial (topical or issue oriented), critical examination of issues or topics, action oriented (promoting a function), publication of research or scholarly articles, and "other" such as making money. Eight of the thirteen items mentioned by ten research editors were classified within the most obvious area - publish research articles. The only item not represented at least one time was the "action oriented category." One research editor provided multiple responses, the others did not.

Editors of scholarly publications gave the broadest descriptive statements. Of the thirty-three editors who responded to this question, there were fifty-one individual items. Fifteen items suggested a reportorial function, thirteen were action oriented, twelve were critical examination of issues, and nine reflected scholarly publication. Fourteen editors supplied two items and three indicated three. In general, a balance occurs among the itesm for "scholarly" publications, though obviously this is not true of individual journals.

Editors of "professional" publications mentioned the reportorial function on approximately forty-five percent of the ninety-two total items. The fifty-five editors responding to this question suggested reader behavior (action-oriented) in somewhat less than a quarter of the items. The other categories were not highly represented. There were twenty-eight multiple responses.

Association publication editors gave equal weight to the association outlet and reporting functions. Only four of the forty-two items indicated were "action oriented." Interestingly, critical examination of topics or issues was not indicated. Multiple responses were given by all but three of the respondents.

Again allowing for multiple responses, we asked the editors what classes of readerships were being served by these purposes: faculty (professors/teachers - in general), specialist faculty (e.g., of computer design), institutional administrators (in general), specialist staff in institutions (e.g., guidance counselors), non-educators (legislators or businessmen), trustees or board members, and students. It should be noted that the differentiation between specialists or generalists in the faculty-staff categories may reflect the lack of specificity of the respondent vis a vis the question rather than the actual audience of the journals. Further, our sampling was such that we excluded as best we could journals oriented to specific teaching areas. We were more likely to include publications, e.g., in counseling and guidance, going to large classes of specialized staff. Rather than precisely enumerating the readerships appropriate to each category, we will note some of the more interesting findings.

Teaching and administrative personnel are the primary readerships of the journals. Interestingly, administrators are more frequently mentioned as readers of research journals, as compared to all other categories including teachers. Editors fail to identify students as an audience although they obviously are. In fact, members of boards of trustees or boards of education and students are identified much less frequently than non-educators. Students are recognized by all but research editors and trustees or board members by all but professional and association media. When one considers journals are especially published for the latter readership, the "servicing" concerns of the editors of the more generalized publications is brought to light. If the editors are correct, trustees have precious little contact with substantive material. Of interest, non-educators comprise about ten percent of the scholarly journals' readership and slightly more of the professional journal audience.

We also asked the editors to indicate how they determined the readers' interests. "Surveys and questionnaires" were used more than one hundred percent more frequently than any other mechanisms which were coded after viewing the items: conferences, letters, editorial boards or advisory boards, activities in the field, intuition, association officers or committees, and other. Research editors use surveys more than twice as much as any other approach including association publisher meetings. Less planned "feedback" mechanisms (e.g., conferences, letters, activities in the field) were not identified.

Scholarly journal editors also conduct surveys, but use a wider variety of sources. Unlike the single items suggested by research editors, respondents identify more than one source. Advisory boards seem more active for this group of editors who also examine reprint requests and subscription lists for indicators of interest. As might be expected a smaller proportion of scholarly editors, as opposed to professional media leadership, use conferences, letters, and activities in the field for indications of interest. With the exception of research editors association editors use conferences less frequently than other editors. Further, because they essentially lack editorial boards, this mechanism is not utilized.

The data clearly illustrate the failure of reader initiated input into journal content. Specially formed advisory groups or association leadership provide suggestions as do editor initiated surveys. But feedback by the broad readership during annual meetings or through letters is generally less frequent. If editors were not proactive in tapping the interests of members, they would operate in a relative vacuum pierced only by close associates and their understanding of the field.

Manuscript Processing

We assessed manuscript processing by (1) tracing the flow of papers addressed to editorial offices; (2) asking editors to specify the type of relationships established between themselves and prospective authors; (3) having the gatekeepers indicate the value of a large number of criteria which might impinge on manuscript selection.

Papers Received

Many factors determine the number of papers received yearly by a journal: the size of the "audience" being served and number of potential authors, the composition of the "audience," whether and in what proportion articles are invited or unsolicited, and even the desired length of the manuscripts. Thus, it is to be expected that journals will receive differing numbers of papers for publishing consideration.

For the population of 130 publications the mean number of papers submitted is more than 150 per year (142 to research journals, 187 to scholarly publications, 177 to professional journals, and 30 to association publications). Means for the scholarly and professional journals are not based on a normal distribution, however, since the former category contains six journals with over 400 received annually, the latter category has seven, two of which receive over 900.

The data suggests that for all but association journals approximately three quarters of journals in each category receive up to two hundred articles a year. The remaining quarter consider a minimum of two hundred fifty to three hundred and higher per year. No research journal receives more than three hundred but, as indicated above, this is untrue in the scholarly and professional categories.

The model data for research journals are the categories 51-100 (3) and 251-300 (3); for scholarly journals 1-50 (11) followed by 51-100 (6) and 401+ (6); for professional journals 1-50 (24), followed by 101-150 (7) and 401+ (7); and for association publications 1-50 (18). A higher percentage of journals have submissions in the 1-50 or lowest category as movement from research to association publications occurs.

The survey utilized a scheme for editors to think in flow-chart fashion how they treated (by percentage) the manuscripts which came before them. We asked what percentage of papers were initially accepted by the editor, rejected by the editor, revised by the editor, sent to the editorial board or special readers, or returned to the author for revision. Following the initial decision to have a paper considered further by reviewers, for what percent was acceptance, rejection, or revision suggested? Subsequently we inquired into the treatment of revised manuscripts.

Only summary data will be discussed in this report. It should be noted that some unevenness exists among the respondents' completion of this section of the survey. Therefore, it is difficult to know if failure to indicate a percentage reflects nonresponse or a zero percentage.

It is more probable editors will accept a paper as it is submitted initially as one moves from the more to less scholarly publications. Research editors accept approximately four percent, scholarly editors 17 percent, professional editors 22 percent and association editors 30 percent of manuscripts submitted. Although they may be discussed with office staff, these papers do not leave the "offices" and go to outside readers. Similarly, a smaller percentage of editors will not initially accept papers as one moves in the same direction. Fifty percent of the research editors, 30 percent of the scholarly editors, 22 percent of professional editors and 9 percent of the association editors do not accept any materials outright.

Research editors initially reject twenty-one percent of the material received; scholarly and professional journal editors reject 34 percent; association editors, forty-six percent. Twenty-five percent of the research editors initially reject nothing. This is true of twenty-two percent of scholarly and professional editors while only four percent of the association editors fall into this category.

Editors' efforts at revising manuscripts for authors are more likely the less scholarly the journal. The means range from one percent for research editors, to three percent for scholarly, to fifteen percent for professional, and to seventeen percent for association publications. One finds a reversal in the percentages of manuscripts returned to the authors for revision prior to their being read by other readers. Twelve percent of the research journal material, nine percent of the scholarly, six percent of the professional and three percent of the associational is returned for further work.

TABLE 11

Disposition of Manuscripts by Editor

	Journal Category			
	R	S	P	A
Accepted by Editor (%)	4	17	22	30
Rejected by Editor	21	34	34	46
Revised by Editor	1	3	15	17
Returned for Revision	12	9	6	3
Sent to Editorial Board	50	34	12	0.2
Sent to Special Readers	12	5	5	3

That not all journals have editorial boards, has been confirmed earlier in this report. Thus, many of the journal editors cannot use this mechanism for manuscript review. However, "special readers," - whether officials within an agency or subject matter specialists, are theoretically accessible to each editor.

Research editors are most likely to send manuscript materials for review by board members or special readers; 50 percent of these manuscripts go to boards and 12 percent to other specialists. Scholarly editors send 34 percent of the material to their boards and five percent to others; professional editors transmit twelve percent to boards and five to others; association gatekeepers send less than one percent to boards and only three percent to others.

Of the material which is transmitted from the editorial office to other reviewers, scholarly articles (twenty-two percent) show the highest recommended acceptance rate. Nineteen percent of the research papers, fourteen percent of the professional and fifteen percent of the associational receive positive reactions. Thirty percent of both research and scholarly articles, sixteen percent of the professional publications and eight percent of the associational have rejection suggested by outside readers.

Outside readers recommend revision for twenty-five percent of the research articles, twenty-four percent of the scholarly, thirteen percent of the professional, and ten percent of the associational. These suggestions, assumedly transmitted by editors to authors, result in a fairly high resubmission rate. The model response ranges from eight to one-hundred percent. Of those resubmitted the mean acceptance rate is sixty-four percent. Another rejection or further revision also occurs.

We did not directly question the editors about overall acceptance and rejection rates, but one can infer "early" acceptance by combining the percentages of manuscripts accepted by editors and recommendations of acceptance by editorial boards. We assume, on the whole, that editors follow the recommendations.

TABLE 12

"Early" Acceptance

	R	S	P	A
Accepted by editor	4	17	22	30
Recommended acceptance by readers	19	22	14	15
	23	39	36	45

These figures are conservative since they do not include action on revised articles. The editor's position on acceptances in relation to the board and the readers follows a subordinate to dominant role as one moves from one category to another.

Although a substantial number of professional and association publications do not have editorial boards our question refers to "readers" who, regardless of location, are available in a scholarly community or administrative agency.

Rejection rates follow the same pattern.

TABLE 13

"Early" Rejection

	R	S	P	A
Rejected by editor	21	34	34	46
Rec rejection by readers	30	30	16	8
	51	64	50	54

The acceptance and rejection rates do not total 100% because the data above do not take into account the percentages of manuscripts suggested for revision which are revised and subsequently acted upon. Also, these data are based on editors' perceptions as opposed to controlled counts.

It should be indicated once again that these are summary data and do not reflect the rather wide variations presented by journals in each category. One professional journal editor accepts between eighty and one hundred percent of the material submitted and three others reject the same percentage range.

In an earlier section of the survey we asked editors who made the decisions concerning the acceptance of manuscripts. Editors of research and scholarly journals are likely to use the combination of themselves with the advice of the reviewers. This combination was most frequently indicated for these journal categories; the editor alone was increasingly identified by professional and associational editors. Further, editors of the more substantive journals indicated that reviewers had a "great deal" of influence on the choice process, and professional editors' most likely reaction was "an average amount" in reviewer impact. Association editors gave "great deal" the most frequent mention, but these probably reflect associational and editorial staff influence on acceptance decisions.

All four journal categories felt the impact of editorial office staffs. Seventeen percent of the research journals, 24 percent of the scholarly, 36 percent of the professional and 17 percent of the associational are so impacted. Additionally, professional and associational publications cite the impact of the agencys' staff. However, of interest, is the strength of staff impact in substantive publications and its relative weakness in less scholarly journals. Elaboration on this occurs in the final section of the report.

Coding the open-ended responses, we asked editors how they used reviewers comments. The two most frequent uses were advising of the editor and development of feedback to authors. While research editors were as likely to indicate both, scholarly journal editors are two and one half times more likely to use feedback for themselves. This expands to a 3:1 ratio for professional editors and a 6:1 ratio for associational gatekeepers. Undoubtedly different reasons prompt these ratios -- these speak to author relations discussed in the previous section.

In addition, data indicate two scholarly editors use reviewer material to support the editorial judgment as do three professional editors.

A number of scholarly and professional journals in education publish thematic issues. Reviewer comments and reactions to unsolicited papers, and their use, often depends on their relevance to what an editor -- "issue editors" at times -- has developed as a special issue topic.

Further, as was indicated in the methodology section, journals are frequently not all of one piece. Reviewers can judge research articles in what is basically a small section comprising a professional journal.

Criteria for Manuscript Selection

A major portion of the survey was designed to assess the actual criteria used by editors to base their decisions as to a manuscript's acceptability. We requested the respondents to indicate the importance of eighteen process and twenty-three content criteria, with a rating of 5 signifying most importance, 4 - great importance, 3 - average importance, 2 - less importance, 1 - least importance. The process items consist of those which speak to the values and norms implicit in a paper while the content items refer more explicitly to how data are used and their orientation to the field of education.

Process Criteria

Because of the large number of variables in this section, by total and as differentiated between journal categories, the reader is urged to review the table (p. 51) to examine the relative importance of each criterion.

For all but research editors for whom the appropriate use of statistics loans considerable significance, overall clarity and conciseness of writing is the most important item. In general, appropriateness of total organization and validity of logic used also had high scores. To interpret the differential ratings of these items is somewhat difficult since "appropriateness" and "validity" would seem to hold importance regardless of journal type. It may be editors equated "appropriate use of statistics" to "use of" and "validity of logic" to "philosophizing."

In examining research journals, we find the aforementioned items of great importance. Also given high scores were the theoretical grounding of papers and their compatibility with disciplinary ethics -- those, for example, which speak to human subject research.

There are a number of items which speak to the community of scholarship, both past, present, and future: "Use of bibliography, suggestions for future research, review of literature on subject, replicability." Although these items received ratings generally indicating above average importance, they certainly did not approach great importance. Unlike research in the traditional disciplines it may be the pastiche nature of educational research, the involvement of scholars with a greater issue or topical orientation, research that is less cumulative than in the basic fields, studies not "integrated" by basic paradigms or research or theoretical models which cause editors to give these dimensions surprisingly weak importance. Educational research may not be marked by what Diana Crane (1967) identifies as invisible colleges, it may be that

TABLE 14

Criteria for Acceptability: Process

	Total		R		S		P		A	
	x	S.D.								
Appropriateness Total Organ.	3.35	1.04	4.16	0.71	4.21	0.78	3.81	1.02	3.76	1.51
Emotional Neut. of Author	2.54	1.06	3.54	0.93	2.62	1.06	2.44	0.93	2.05	1.14
Clarity & Conciseness of Writing	4.12	0.81	4.00	0.60	4.35	0.67	3.98	0.72	4.20	1.24
Approp. Use of Statistics	3.29	1.22	4.33	0.65	3.51	1.12	2.90	1.22	3.29	1.26
Theoretically Grounded	3.14	1.10	3.75	0.75	3.44	1.08	2.96	1.08	2.64	1.16
Review of Literature on Subject	2.66	1.15	3.36	0.80	3.02	1.11	2.42	1.07	2.17	1.28
Adherence to Stylistic Guidelines	2.44	1.12	3.09	1.04	2.43	1.14	2.28	1.05	2.52	1.28
Reputation of Author	2.51	1.30	1.41	0.66	2.27	1.30	2.75	1.29	3.05	1.14
Discuss Limitations of Data or Theory	2.87	0.95	3.25	0.96	3.08	0.98	2.72	0.82	2.58	1.12
Use of Bibliography	1.97	1.04	2.36	1.20	2.59	1.04	1.65	0.83	1.35	0.78
Replicability	2.56	1.25	3.54	0.68	2.69	1.34	2.45	1.20	1.86	1.06
Sugs. for Future Res/Thought/Action	3.22	1.11	3.27	0.78	3.29	1.17	3.24	1.14	2.94	1.08
Validity of Logic	3.91	0.92	4.16	0.71	4.24	0.83	3.72	1.00	3.66	0.76
Compatibility w. Disciplinary Ethics	3.31	1.08	3.70	0.82	3.54	0.90	3.11	1.24	3.17	1.01
Spirited Style	3.44	0.96	2.27	0.90	3.48	0.83	3.50	0.96	3.88	0.75
Alternative Interp. of Data Presented	2.73	0.85	3.00	0.63	2.91	0.84	2.60	0.82	2.58	1.06
Use of Standard Empirical Methods	2.45	1.04	3.40	0.69	2.71	1.15	2.16	0.89	2.17	0.95
Use of Experimental Design	2.42	1.05	3.18	0.87	2.36	1.04	2.36	1.05	2.23	1.03

individual researchers work in relative isolation, a result of the structure of the field and/or the organizational characteristics of colleges of education, serving a large variety of functions with their professional personnel and knowledge generation playing a relatively minor part.

Interestingly, the "reputation of the author" is the least important criterion.

Scholarly editors provide the highest ratings to appropriateness of total organization, clarity and conciseness of writing, validity of logic used, all rather broad measures, and provide lower scores than do research editors for items speaking to the markings of a research paper. Of interest, the three criteria mentioned above are seen as more important by this group than by research editors. Scholarly editors also provide higher ratings to "reputation of author" and the use of a "spirited style." It is of interest that these editors who have greater topicality of content in their publications than do research editors, give less than strong support to the cognitive and action possibilities derived from printing a paper. Further, a significant decline occurs in an adherence to stylistic guidelines. As we have seen this may be because few guidelines are disseminated to authors. Curiously, these editors who give strongest support for "total organization" and the "quality of writing" fail to ground these needs into some firmer guidelines.

Earlier the survey asked whether a style guide was available to prospective authors. As might be expected the more research oriented publications were more likely to have this guide available. Eight percent of the research, twenty-five percent of the scholarly, sixty-seven percent of the professional and seventy-eight percent of the associational editors did not use one. Research journals only used the APA guide. Scholarly publications were most likely to use their own guide, but the most frequented prepared one was the Chicago Manual of Style, with MLA used more frequently than APA. Of the professional journal editors using a guide all but three indicated it was their own. Although the requirements of these guides may inform final manuscript editing they seem not to impinge directly on the choice process.

Professional editors provide the narrowest range of process scores. Though they give higher ratings to those also perceived as important by the other groups, their data indicate little differentiation occurs in the minds of respondents; criteria are homogeneously perceived. "Form" may be unimportant, but a difference in the content ratings, discussed below, might allow for discrimination.

When compared with responses of other groups, the process criteria deemed important by association gatekeepers are in a logical direction for most items. One would expect "replicability" and the "use of a bibliography" would be least important and author reputation be more important. The editors' journalism background would argue for their highest rating of writing quality.

A number of items, however, are more difficult to interpret. "Appropriate use of statistics" probably has a high rating because these editors publish salary oriented data, survey reports and do not use the item to refer to empirical relevance. Surprisingly, high scores went to the "use of standard empirical methods" and "use of experimental designs." Though one could reason the use of surveys and interviews comprise standard methodologies, editors' responses to another question indicate they do not use experimental designs. This rating thus speaks to a problem we address in depth below. Editors either did not understand the item or answered in an expected direction.

In order to both understand the methodologies used in various journals we indicated to editors "there are a variety of methodologies and approaches to knowledge generation used by authors. Which approaches or models are typically used in manuscripts which appear in your journal?

The responses to this question were disappointing. There was a high non-response rate and a number of individuals indicated the question was vague, impossible to answer in the space provided. They used eclectic or no typical approach.

Despite many difficulties categorizing responses we created seven which seemed to capture the data: Surveys (personal and written); case studies; analytic or scholarly thought; reportorial - descriptive - experiential; use of research findings, data; experimental methods; intuition and personal opinion. We decided not to create categories for responses in order not to shape the answers. But the answers did not permit comparative uses as much as we had hoped.

Two-thirds of the responding research editors typically mentioned research data or analytic thought. Scholarly editors indicated the latter category ("well reasoned pieces," "historical/reflective") with high mention of research data and case studies. A number of responses were undecipherable. We believe these speak more to the ability of the respondent to entertain this question than its comprehensibility: "no typical- since we are primarily concerned with the future-oriented rather than rehash of the past (10 years or older) materials;" "more often than not an eco-relational approach. Concern is usually with the interrelatedness of the ways of knowing." There are of course more reasonable and understandable items, (e.g., "wide variety - position papers to case studies - to descriptive techniques and procedures to experimental studies. Quality in each area is the important variable and appeals to readers.")

Professional journal editors are most likely to mention "reportorial - descriptive - experiential" items with "case studies" which are closely related being of second importance. Association gatekeepers had particular difficulty with this question. One editor mentioned the use of experimental material but others indicated: "this is the criteria I use -- if I don't comprehend the material, the 'average school board member in __________' won't"; "to be clear, concise and consistent"; "non-jargon."

Respondents from all categories had considerable trouble describing in straightforward terms, the methodologies used. Obviously approaches to to knowledge generation is not an area of concern to them.

Content Criteria

In addition to process items we requested editors to respond to a large number of content items (see Table 15, p. 55).

Interestingly research editors provide their highest score to "applicability to practical problems in the field." "Long-term definitive value, contribution to education as a field of study, contribution to basic knowledge and interest to readers" all receive scores suggesting very high importance. When confronted with a variety of methodologically oriented criteria, there is support of their previously mentioned data and scholarly (theoretical) interest, but even here the scores seem to be below what they should be. Surprisingly, opinion pieces seem to be as important as data presented with limited discussion of implications; these are less important than discussions of educational issues. Research journals seemingly do not present research but discuss its implications to existing problems in the field. Originality is slightly more important than an article's relation to current research, which though of high significance, does not match its pragmatic value.

Scholarship editors are most concerned with meeting reader interest and believe this is accomplished by selecting timely, original articles applicable to field based problems. There is a commitment to contribute to basic knowledge and to anticipate emerging problems. Research editors generally stress depth over breadth. The gap between the two variables decreases though the position remains in the same direction throughout.

As opposed to a more theoretical orientation scholarship editors give highest methodological rating to discussion of educational issues and also focus on discussions of data's implications. These gatekeepers give a relatively strong score to policy papers, and interestingly, of the four categories they provide the highest score to opinion pieces.

Above all others professional journal editors are concerned about timeliness, applicability, and meeting readers' interests. Unlike scholarly editors they are not as committed to anticipating problems in the field. Methodologically they support discussions of educational issues with a clearer focus than the previously mentioned journal categories.

Of special interest, in addition to very high ratings to dimensions identified as highly important to professional editors, association editors attributed significance to "good" taste. One wonders why for most categories this is more important than the professional controversiality of the topic and certainly social controversiality. It is also of interest how timely topics for all editors do not assume, in particular, socially controversial items.

TABLE 15

Criteria for Acceptability:Content

	Total		R		S		P		A	
	x	S.D.								
Timeliness of Topic	4.33	0.73	3.83	0.83	4.27	0.73	4.48	0.60	4.38	0.86
Applicability to Practical Probs in Field	4.34	0.80	4.25	0.75	4.21	0.88	4.42	0.81	4.40	0.68
Depth	3.48	0.91	3.83	0.93	3.70	0.90	3.34	0.90	3.22	0.87
Breadth	3.17	0.80	3.08	0.99	3.40	0.72	3.07	0.81	3.05	0.80
Contribution to Basic Knowledge	3.61	1.03	4.08	0.90	3.91	1.02	3.22	1.03	3.83	0.78
Interest to Readers	4.55	0.56	4.08	0.28	4.45	0.65	4.65	0.51	4.71	0.46
Professional Controversiality of Topic	3.32	1.08	2.75	0.86	3.47	1.08	3.25	1.08	3.57	1.12
Anticipatory of Probs in Field	3.72	1.00	3.16	0.93	3.97	1.02	3.69	0.91	3.68	1.15
Contribution to Education as Field of Study	3.25	1.17	4.16	1.03	3.27	1.26	3.00	1.10	3.38	1.03
Orientation to General Readership	3.14	1.17	2.50	1.08	3.10	1.17	3.17	1.15	3.55	1.19
Social Controversiality of Topic	2.79	1.02	2.54	0.82	2.75	1.21	2.84	0.89	2.88	1.13
Good Taste	3.53	0.97	3.09	0.83	3.51	1.01	3.49	0.96	4.00	0.90
Originality	3.87	0.93	3.91	0.79	4.02	0.79	3.74	1.04	3.94	0.93
Based on Current Research in Field	3.10	0.99	3.83	0.83	3.35	0.85	2.72	1.04	3.16	0.78

TABLE 15 - (Continued)

	Total		R		S		P		A	
Interest to Education Professors	2.60	1.21	3.16	0.93	2.86	1.08	2.25	1.18	2.66	1.49
Descriptive Orientation	2.66	1.04	2.00	0.85	2.64	1.13	2.69	0.98	3.05	0.99
Of Long Term Definitive Value	3.27	1.08	4.00	0.89	3.59	1.23	2.94	0.91	3.11	0.96
Value Oriented Opinion Pieces	2.95	1.01	2.45	1.03	3.10	1.07	2.94	0.98	2.94	0.93
Policy Oriented Position Paper	2.99	1.08	3.00	0.77	3.45	1.12	2.68	0.99	2.88	1.18
Data Presented w/limited Discussion of Implications	2.29	1.05	2.50	1.16	2.24	0.98	2.25	1.04	2.38	1.19
Theoretical Orientation	2.52	1.09	3.41	0.90	2.91	1.16	2.05	0.81	2.44	1.19
Discussion of Data Implications	3.15	1.13	3.83	0.71	3.62	1.08	2.70	1.11	3.00	0.97
Discussion of Educational Issues	3.71	1.08	2.91	1.16	3.86	1.08	3.74	1.08	3.83	0.85

It is telling to compare association gatekeepers with professional and scholarly editors. A greater concern for contributing to basic knowledge occurs almost parallel in importance to that attributed by scholarly editors, and they have greater interest in contributing to education as a field of study than do scholarly editors. More theoretically interested than professional editors, they also provide a surprising concern for manuscripts grounding in current research.

Both research and association editors are more narrowly focused and may recognize, for one, the need to make connections with the issues, and for the other, to be more effective by relating to scholarship. The professional journal editor seems to be the most "disconnected" except for extreme topical orientation.

Before the section dealing with these criteria, we asked the editors the two major reasons why manuscripts were rejected and we coded the data into the following categories: the manuscript was too scholarly, poorly written, unscholarly, had too much or too little emphasis on practical implications, and was unsuited to readers. Out of the 232 items mentioned 121 indicated poor writing or technical execution and 82 suggested that the papers were unsuited to the readership. Both speak to the high emphasis placed on these items later in the questionnaire under the content category.

Research editors focus primarily on the technical aspects of manuscripts in their responses: "poor research design," "weak rationale," "inadequate design and execution of study," "incomplete reporting of study," "inadequate methodological design." Interestingly these items do not suggest the most important criteria chosen by these editors. Possibly technical adequacy is more or less assumed for many articles submitted, and many are rejected on these grounds. But what differentiates those technically adequate papers into those retained or those published are the ones which speak to practical problems in the field.

Scholarly journal editors also frequently mention both technical excellence (execution of scholarship - writing quality) and relevance to reader interest. The gap between these areas diminishes from the research category (16-6) to the scholarly (44-24) and continues in this direction. Sample items from the actual responses include: "not suitable to our general, high caliber readership, poorly written"; "poor quality of scholarship, not of sufficient scope to be of interest to our members"; lack of fresh view, poor writing"; "material is not statistically sound or style is reprehensible." The notion of "fresh view" was repeated by those we interviewed when we asked about papers which interested them. Although one could argue the significance of this measure, one could also question the base upon which the judgments are based. Is freshness related to what is being written and discussed in the field or in the editor's experience with manuscripts?

Professional editors provide the same high mentions as their colleagues but the gap is reduced (48-38). Further, four editors mention incoming material is too scholarly. We found in our interviews that professional editors, one as a result of a question and another without provocation, belittled the kind of material written by the professoriate. The term "jargonish" meant more than a quality of writing, it spoke as well to the type of author. Typical remarks by the professional editors include: "poor writing, obscure subject," "too long, too short," "inappropriate content (non-educational), too lengthy and pedantic," "duplicate what we've already published or are committed to publish," "rough notes from somebody's speech," "inappropriate for the audience, material previously covered."

Many journals publish special issues and assemble materials on a topic either through invitation or through unsolicited sources. Further, some editors will publish only one paper on a topic and will either return or hold for a long period other papers on the same area. Thus, a number of papers are returned less for intrinsic reasons than the marketing interests of the editors. Our interviews uncovered that some papers were treated more positively because they happened to be available when a special topic issue was going to press.

Finally, with association publication editors we reverse the position between rationales based on suitability to readers and the technical (writing) quality of the manuscripts (14-13). Some responses include: "Doesn't conform to the needs of the audience or association as I see them," "Sounds too much like a Doctor's or Master's thesis. Not of general interest," "uninteresting, boring," "Not closely related to the purposes of the organization."

Book Reviews

We asked editors if their journals published book reviews as well as the selection criteria. Publishers are not particularly accurate in transmitting what they believe are volumes speaking to the interests of particular journals and editors do exercise the option of requesting books from publishers for review purposes.

There were seventy-six respondents to our query. Of the fifty-four non-respondents, it is not possible to know what percentage simply failed to answer the question and the number who do not publish reviews. We coded the open-ended responses which were in two categories primarily: the volume made a contribution to the field or it was assumed to be of interest to the readers. A large number of responses could not be categorized, especially for the professional journals.

As might be expected, "contribution to the field" was indicated three times more frequently than "interest to readers" in the research journals. Only one research editor indicated the book review section had a strategic value - in broadening readership input (through reviews) and the cognitive servicing because of the extremely narrow focus of the articles published. Another editor disclaimed responsibility by mentioning choices were made by the book review editor.

Editors of scholarly journals indicate choices of books serve reader interest somewhat more than being a contribution to the field. The editors also indicate: "timeliness of topic, interest to readers"; "currency, relevance, use of books from among different publishers"; "Geographical location of author." A number of editors do not publish reviews but do list books received.

Professional journal editors are two and a half times more likely to refer to reader interest than contribution to field. A variety of fascinating responses occur: "variety of titles"; "children's books are field tested in classrooms and children's responses determine use"; professional books are sent to experts in area of emphasis. Only favorable reviews are printed; "a variety of subjects, level of complexity and points of view as well as current interest"; "publishers information."

Those association editors who use reviews mention reader interest three times more frequently than contribution to field. One editor mentions authors must reside in the state in which the journal's readership is located. But, it is of interest that a statement of the following breadth should appear: "subject matter deals with questions of major importance to society in which educators should find special significance."

Personal Interviews

Our interviews supported the knowledge gained from the general survey data. Research and scholarly editors tend to regard themselves as policy setters, directors, and, at times, final arbitors when conflicts over materials submitted develops. While not totally uninvolved in the mechanical procedures of publication, they have a much stronger tendency to leave these matters almost entirely in the hands of subordinates, with little direct supervision unless problems arise. Their concern with the more cerebral elements of the editorial role stem, in part, both from their other work roles and expectations unconnected with journal publication and from the reasons for their selection for the editorship position - knowledge of the field, a record of scholarship, and a degree of notoriety. The typical research and/or scholarly editor is most active in reading manuscripts when they are submitted, selecting those for submission to editorial board members or special readers, communication with authors, and determining what will actually be the content and scope of each individual edition. These editors see themselves as educational decision makers influential in their areas of expertise, and tend to participate in the activities of the field such as conferences and conventions.

Apparently the professional and associational editors tend to be selected more for their journalistic and publishing expertise than for their prominence in their "knowledge" field. It is not surprising then to find these editors are more likely to be concerned with the mechanics of publication than their research and scholarly counterparts. The professional and associational editors, like the other subjects, tend to leave the actual mechanical details to subordinates but they are more likely to exercise direct supervision over the work of their staffs and to regard final decisions about such matters more on a par with decisions about the journal content.

This should not be construed to mean these editors are unconcerned with content decisions. They too tend to regard themselves as educational decision makers, although they do not think of themselves on a collegial basis with their readers. Rather, the editors in these two groups gave responses indicating they consider themselves more in a management position serving a clientele with special interests much like the editors of other publications with a focused audience interests. These editors are much more likely to play roles more traditionally associated with newspaper or magazine publishing including development of story ideas, assignment of topics to other staff members for article writing, and final editing of these materials. It should be noted, however, that these differences in editorial roles are usually of degree rather than kind. The editors of professional and associational journals also receive manuscripts from outside authors and often will assign them to readers or members of their staff or of their organization they feel are qualified to pass on the appropriateness of the materials for their publications.

In terms of the content and process criteria for manuscript selection, the professional and associational editors evidenced a preference for the interesting article that speaks to the entire readership. They were nearly unanimous in their criticisms of manuscripts submitted by academicians as being unable to translate theories into practical application and for being loaded with jargon and sloppy writing. Of more concern to these editors is journal publication that will attract a wide readership. They, therefore, were much more likely to emphasize those qualities of manuscripts which would attract and hold the casual reader thumbing through the journal. Research and scholarly editors, on the other hand, were more likely to emphasize knowledge advancement, thoroughness of methodology, and theoretical underpinnings in their manuscript evaluation. Again, however, these differences were only a matter of degree. The professional and associational editors were also concerned their materials make a contribution, albeit a practical one, to their readers' knowledge and skills, and the research and scholarly editors were quick to point out they certainly preferred a well-written piece with a unique or novel perspective to a manuscript well done methodologically but full of jargon or a repetition of materials published in earlier issues.

CHAPTER 6

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The purposes of the demographic information section of the field survey questionnaire were to provide data on personal characteristics of the editors of education journals. The data were analyzed with an eye to providing 1) an overall picture of the types of individuals comprising this select population of educational decision makers; 2) insights of those characteristics, if any, which set apart or distinguish the subjects; and 3) variables for further cross tabulations of the data.

Educational and Occupational Background

The first series of demographic questions asked respondents for data on their academic training beginning with their undergraduate school, university degree and major area of study. Similar responses were requested regarding advanced study and other specialized training. The researchers were primarily concerned with the editors' most recent academic training prior to assuming their roles as editors. The responses indicate more editors of journals received their most recent academic training at schools or universities in the eastern part of the country than in any other section (40% in the East as compared to 27% in the Midwest, 13% in the West and 11% in the South).

Breaking the data into the four component groups revealed two exceptions to this overall trend. Interestingly editors of research journals tend to have attended schools or universities in the Midwest (42%) rather than the East (25%) or the South (18%) or the West (8%). This is not totally surprising, however, given the large number of Midwest universities with large graduate schools of education emphasizing research. This may also be in part related to the contact of leading educational researchers at these institutions which dovetails with the interest of those who may be most influential in selecting candidates for the role of editor.

Association editors provided the other exception to the general trend. Their answers indicate their most recent degrees tend to be equally distributed between the East and the Midwest (35% in each area). More attended schools or universities in the South (22%) than did editors in any other group (17% research editors, 8% scholarly editors and 7% professional editors). However, editors in this category were likely representing associations in this section of the country.

The type of school or university at which the highest proportion of all editors received their most recent degrees was the "research university" (58%) as classified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education typology (197). Forty-six percent received their degrees from "Research University 1" institutions while 12 percent obtained their degrees from

"Research University II" institutions. Sixteen percent received their degrees from "doctoral granting universities," 14 percent from "Doctoral Granting University I" and two percent from "Doctoral Granting University II." Of particular note is that only four percent obtained their most recent degree from "Liberal Arts schools."

The most recent academic degrees held by editors are rather evenly divided among the B.A. degree (23%), the M.A. (22%), the Ph.D. (23%) and the Ed.D. (19%). Two percent of the editors hold a professional master's degree. Given the population under study it was somewhat surprising to discover only 42 percent of the editors now hold a doctoral degree. It was assumed for data analysis that between 65 and 70 percent would hold doctoral degrees, however this result tends to support other data indicating a substantial number of editors come from a journalism rather than an educationally related background.

Seventy-five percent of the research editors hold a Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree while 66 percent of the scholarly editors have a doctoral degree. Professional editors are relatively even divided with 33 percent holding M.A. degrees, 17 percent having Ph.D.'s and 14 percent having Ed.D's. None of the associational editors holds a Ph.D. Most (83%) hold a B.A. degree (57%) or an M.A. degree (26%). Four percent have professional degrees.

The academic majors most represented are education (45%) and journalism (21%). The humanities represent the next highest category with 12 percent, while professional disciplines account for 6 percent, behavioral sciences for 5 percent and social sciences for 4 percent. The only major academic area not represented was the natural sciences.

The overwhelming majority (70%) of the scholarly editors received their most recent training in education as compared to research editors (58%), professional editors (40%), and only 9 percent of the associational editors. These results were as hypothesized. It was expected scholarly editors, more concerned with the theoretical aspects of education as a discipline, would be the product of graduate education and training, while research editors would reflect a wider ranging social science orientation. It was also expected that the professional and associational editors would have a more professional background. This is reflected in the finding that none of the research editors and only 3 percent of the scholarly editors have training in journalism while 21 percent of the professional editors and 61 percent of the associational editors report that journalism represents the most recent educational field of study.

The next series of questions focused on the professional experience of the respondent. The highest proportion of editors (40%) work for administrative agencies. Thirty-four percent work for profession-education organizations, while 9 percent are on the staffs of education institutions, and 2 percent classify themselves as students. Research and scholarly editors proportionately are found more often in professional education organizations (67% and 54% respectively) than are associational editors (17% and 26%, respectively). Fifty-three percent of professional editors and 65 percent of associational editors work for an administrative agency, compared to 16 percent of the scholarly editors and none of the research editors. Clearly these data correlate positively with the four classifications determined prior to the data analysis.

The data were then analyzed in terms of level of current employment status. The data were divided into three categories: full professor/higher level management; associate professor/middle management; assistant professor/lower level management. Most research editors (50%) are either full professors or in higher level management positions. Thirty-three percent are at the associate professor or middle management level. Similarly, most scholarly editors are either at the full professor/upper management level (43%) or associate professor/middle level (27%). These results tend to confirm the decision-making responsibilities of editors in the scholarly professional areas. The largest proportion of professional and associational editors (41% and 48%, respectively) are in associate professor/middle level positions while approximately 30 percent of each group are in the assistant professor or lower level position, thus confirming our hypothesis that their editorial positions are more functional.

Of those editors affiliated with educational institutions, the largest proportion of research editors (50%) are affiliated with institutions designated "Research University I." Forty-three percent of the scholarly editors, 3 percent of the professional editors and none of the associational editors are affiliated with "Research University I." Again, the data correspond to the expectations of the researchers in that it was hypothesized journal editors of research and scholarly oriented publications would more likely be affiliated with institutions conducive to research and scholarly thought.

The next series of questions was designed to measure the scholarly output and interests of the academic journal editors. Items dealt with the research and publishing efforts of the individual respondents, methods of maintaining currency with the literature of the field, the maintenance of collegial ties with other members of the profession through membership, and service in professional organizations. The responses to the field survey indicate, perhaps surprisingly, that there does not seem to be a serious lack of scholarly output from the journal editors. While most editors (65%) have not published at all in the past three years, the breakdown by the four major categories reveals that the major non-publishing group is represented by the associational editors, 91 percent of whom have not written for publication. On the other hand, approximately 70 percent of the research editors, 50 percent of the scholarly editors and 30 percent of the professional editors have published at least once during this time period. Of those editors publishing articles, scholarly editors have published on the average more (an average of 3.29) than research editors (2.50) or professional editors (.91). This tends to reflect other results indicating scholarly editors are generally younger and more likely to be in middle level positions than research editors, and therefore perhaps more concerned with development of professional reputations. Most editors who have published have published articles in other publications. Few have published books or edited monographs. None of the associational editors reported he had written a book. The scholarly editors' book writing was concentrated among five respondents who had published two books each and two more who had written four and five books, respectively. Only three research editors reported they had written books or monographs and only four professional editors indicated similar publications.

Turning from dissemination to acquisition of information, it was perhaps surprising that associational editors report subscribing to or reading regularly an average of more professional journals (8.7) than professional editors (5.7), scholarly editors (5.2) or research editors (4.6). However, it can be assumed time spent with and the study of subscribed publications differ considerably among the editor categories. Research editors generally examine more substantive publications. Our interviews suggest association and professional editors read to ascertain the activities in which similar, out-of-state organizations are engaged.

Editors' enumeration of actual publication titles to which they subscribed, derived the descriptive statistics.

As expected, research editors indicate "reading" research publications, and (to a small degree) scholarly and professional journals. Most frequently research journals are either in the field of education, often closely allied to the editor's specialty, or in the field of psychology. No other substantive field is represented. The only "ideational" publications mentioned were the Harvard Educational Review and the American Scholar. Of course, some editors excluded this type of publication under the assumption they were not professional journals.

Editors of scholarly publications enumerate the "richest" combinations of titles, suggesting the cognitive complexity or integrative needs and interests of those who serve these media. The following combinations are representative:

> Educational Record, AAUP Bulletin, Change Magazine, American Sociological Review, Sociology of Education, Administrative Science Quarterly, Contemporary Sociology, Higher Education
>
> American Historical Review, Phi Delta Kappan, Educational Forum, Review of Educational Research, Educational Theory, History of Education Quarterly, Comparative Education Review, Bildung nud Erziehung, Uchitelskaya Gazete (Russian), American Science Educational Research Journal, International Review of Education.
>
> English Journal, American Psychologist, Journal of the History of Ideas.

Certainly several editors are less cognitively broad-based. One editor, for example, mentioned only the Elementary School Journal and the Phi Delta Kappan. However, in general, many individuals mention a broad base of publications according to our classifications and substantive field.

Editors of professional journals demonstrate somewhat less breadth, though exceptions do exist. They focus primarily on professional journals and deal predominantly with teaching-learning, in contrast to broader education issues. Typical are the following:

> Young Children, National Elementary Principal, Today's Education, Journal of Teacher Education, Educational Leadership.
>
> Instructor, Learning, Teacher, Young Children, Voka Review, Journal of Learning Disabilities, School Arts, Education USA, Media Industry Newsletter.
>
> Mental Retardation, American Association of Mental Deficiency Journal.

Although we did not request non-professional publications, several editors provided clues to these reading habits. (Of course, these may have been perceived as professional.) "Newsweek, Atlantic Monthly, Mad, Playboy, The New Yorker, Screw, MacLeans, New Times" are one editor's diet. Another editor mentioned the "Public Interest, Dissent, Harper's, Atlantic, Center Magazine, and Encounter." A third indicated, "I read lively magazines such as The New Yorker, Sunday Times Magazine; reading professional journals is a good way to develop hardening of your own creative juices."

In addition to reading publications produced by sister associations in other states or on other societal levels, association publication editors focus on professional journals. A number maintain awareness of issues in the field through reading the Educational Digest. As might be expected, given these editors' professional training and previous experiences, journalism media receives frequent mention: Quill, Public Relations Journal, Print, Writer's Digest.

The final question sequence in the demographic section of the field survey questionnaire was designed to elicit information about the respondents' more personal characteristics. Fifty-three percent of the responding editors report their ages are between 35 and 49. Twenty-eight percent are 50 or older, while 15 percent are 34 or younger. The cross tabulation of the four major groups indicates research editors tend to be older than the average. This perhaps reflects the more prescribed and lengthy process of rising through the academic community's ranks to achieve the requisite status for consideration for such a position by one's colleagues.

Scholarly editors tend to be relatively evenly divided between ages 35 to 44 (41%) and ages 45 or over (51%). Interestingly, over 70 percent of association editors, those with more professional journalism orientation, are 44 and younger. The pattern for associational and professional journal editors is to have 10 to 15 years of professional journalistic experience before assuming the role of editors.

Somewhat surprisingly, 23 percent of all journal editors are female. Research journals employ the lowest proportion of female editors (8%). The highest proportion of women, 30 percent, are associational editors. Interestingly, less than 5 percent of the respondents consider themselves members of a minority group.

We completed the demographic questions by asking about membership in community, social, cultural, or religious organizations.

Responses indicate associational editors belong to more community, social, cultural, or religious organizations than do professional, scholarly or research editors. Thirty-five percent of associational editors belong to two or more community organizations while at the other end of the spectrum, only eight percent of the research editors list membership in two or more such groups. In fact, if the lack of response can be associated with earlier statements indicating irrelevance when we attempted to assess their value orientations, research editors were loathe to answer this question.

The "ordinariness" of personal organization membership is most interesting. Editors do not generally belong to organizations primarily demonstrating social commitment (either political or issue oriented) or social awareness.

One research editor specified the American Civil Liberties Union. However, the typical scholarly editors affiliated with:

> "United Crusade, Presbyterian Medical Center Board of Directors."
>
> Church, theatrical group.
>
> Eagles, Methodist Church.
>
> Boy Scouts, Roman Catholic Church, Chamber of Commerce.

There is an indication of an International visitors organization and a symphony society. Generally, however, affiliations are decidedly less cosmopolitan than one might expect from the professional publications to which editors subscribe or read regularly.

Professional editors mentioned a variety of denominational affiliations and did mention some community action programs. Further, journalistic associations were indicated (e.g., National Press Club). Although the more traditional Masons, Kiwanis, and Rotary are represented, the ACLU and Council for a Livable World, mental health associations, and action groups (e.g., dealing with Children's T.V.) are also designated. Here more "meaningful" involvement in community affairs, occurs as well as some carry over in one's personal interests of the professional educational commitments in education. Additionally there are a number of "cosmopolitan" memberships (e.g., opera guilds and museums).

Association editors with few exceptions are extraordinarily single-minded in their church affiliations. While they have memberships in Common Cause and some environmental agencies, basically their memberships are religious in orientation. High church membership and affiliation with traditional community service agencies is common. Few educational commitments carry over into these memberships and there is much lower incidence in social awareness, social impact or more cosmopolitan community organizations.

Personal Interviews

The demographic data supplied by the eight editors in the in-depth interviews, while not duplicating the data obtained from the questionnaires, tended to broaden our understanding of the life styles of the academic gatekeeper.

What emerges from the interview data is a portrait of what might term a typically middle class life at present but a widely varying background leading up to their current positions, both professionally and socially.

The varied background was revealed in the responses to probing questions about their educational and previous career records. While not true of all the representatives, perhaps somewhat surprising is that several editors of professional and associational journals indicated they had at one point or another somehow failed at, or been disappointed in, their higher educational schooling. This was regarded typically as something of a virtue, however, because, as one editor phrased it, the experience made him appreciate the sometimes unreality of the ivory-towered professor while making him (the editor) more of a generalist, thus able to perform his role as editor of a widely varying journal more effectively. The editors of the research and scholarly oriented journals, as might be expected, evidenced a more typical educational record culminating in a doctoral degree. They also tended to major in disciplines close to the subject area of their journals, while the professional and association editor evidenced more of a journalism-related background.

This same difference between the scholarly and research editors on the one hand and the professional and associational on the other was clearly drawn in the patterns of previous professional experience. The academic and scholarly editors generally followed a path typical of professional educators, teaching and/or research positions leading to a connection with a university in a professional or administrative position. The typical professional and associational editors, however, could almost be described as stumbling into the editorship after trying out a variety of journalistic and/or administrative areas, with very little prior connection with education at all. That such patterns exist, however, is not surprising when it is remembered the scholarly and research journals editors are often chosen for their knowledge of the field and their relationships with leaders in the field, while the associational and professional editors often are selected for their technical skills in journal editing and production.

The kind and number of professional organizations to which the eight editors belong are generally reflective of the data from the questionnaires, although they tend to belong to several more than the typical editors in the field study. They also tended to have more publications than the average, an indication perhaps of the kinds of criteria that led to their selection for the second data collection phase in the first place. As would be expected from the earlier discussions, the research and scholarly editors were more likely to belong to discipline-oriented organizations while the associational and professional tended to join more "methodological" organizations related to journalism and/or certain kinds of educations. All editors interviewed claimed a wide ranging personal readership ranging from "competing" publications to mass circulation magazines such as Playboy, Newsweek and Time. The eight people interviewed tended to be alike in their personal characteristics. All were white males and, with one exception, were between the ages of 35 and 50. None appeared to be particularly active in their communities and none belonged to any particular partisan or even slightly controversial social groups or organizations. Generally the personal interview data yielded a picture of a family man relatively at peace with his job and his social community rather than a high powered, "mover and shaker" whom some might envision a highly influential decision maker in the educational process to be.

CHAPTER 7

MY CREDO

We were considerably concerned with the larger purposes of the editor's role. In addition to the criteria they used in selecting manuscripts and in choosing editorial board members, we were interested in why the editors acted in particular ways, the philosophies assumed in their behaviors, and the expectations they had both for the future of education and for the publications they edited.

Prime Responsibility

We asked the editors what they believed to be their prime responsibility: developing education as a field of study, initiating or influencing the resolution of problems or issues in the field, influencing those outside the field of education to consider certain problems in education, insuring quality control over manuscripts allowed to appear before the journal audience, serving the interests of the journal's publisher, or serving the interests of the readers.

The data, divided by category, suggest significantly different orientations among the population of editors (see Table 16, p. 70).

Research editors' prime responsibility is to insure manuscript quality control. A wide gap exists between this objective and those of serving reader interests and resolving problems in the field. Editors of scholarly publications give a slightly higher score to manuscript content control, but also rate the need to serve reader interests high. Though they give a somewhat lower score to developing education as a specialty than do research editors, they are more committed to resolving problems by external and internal means. "Professional" editors reverse the priority between insuring quality control and serving reader interest, though both are high. Interestingly they are less concerned with problem resolution than the other two editor groups. Association publication editors give serving reader interests their highest priority, serving the publisher second priority. Thirdly, insuring quality control rates relatively high, though it is low when contrasted to the other editors. This group has the greatest desire to influence those outside the field to consider problems in education.

The editors had an opportunity to add to the list of responsibilities which we established. The single "research" contribution was "raising the level of inquiry in the field." The scholarly editors suggested linking knowledge generation and knowledge utilization, helping others to publish - to stimulate professionals to write more, to promote the growth of the profession, and providing information on new or important issues in education so that readers have more knowledge on which to have

TABLE 16

Editor's Responsibility

	Total		R		S		F		A	
	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.
Dev. Ed. as Spec.	2.74	1.45	3.63	1.28	3.30	1.41	2.48	1.39	1.95	1.23
Resolve Probl. Issues in Fld.	3.63	1.07	3.75	0.75	3.81	1.12	3.56	1.18	3.47	1.03
Infl. Those Outside to Consider Probs	2.73	1.25	2.33	1.23	2.75	1.05	2.42	1.24	3.66	1.19
Ms. Qual. Control	4.20	1.01	4.41	0.79	4.48	0.76	4.05	1.07	3.95	1.23
Serve Publisher	3.22	1.40	2.33	1.07	3.16	1.27	3.13	1.45	4.00	1.30
Serve Ints. of Readers	4.42	0.90	3.81	0.75	4.37	0.82	4.48	0.97	4.63	0.79
Info Dissem.	#7		-		2		4		1	
Other (e.g., Journ. Balance of Mat'l)	12		1		3		7		1	

opinions or attitudes. Though "linkage" notions are suggested in both the tabular and open-ended items, items are added which seem out-of-place: improving public relations through the publication for the college and providing an outlet for the ideas of our own faculty.

The professional editors have an action orientation in their open-ended items: improve the quality of education, offering the practitioner useful information, encourage creative teaching, to point up problems and pitfalls to avoid. Association editors have an interest in serving as an historical record of association events and providing a wide range of information to the field.

Sources of Assumptions

To probe the question of role responsibility further we attempted to learn the factors which influenced the editors' role behavior. We asked, "What experiences, individuals, or books have had most significant impact on the development of your personal approach to education?" To gain insight into their more philosophical understanding of education, we requested they identify contemporary thinkers whose thoughts they shared. We did not believe it would have been fruitful on a survey either to have the editors check formal philosophies with which they identified or to ask them to enunciate one.

Although the actual responses are enlightening, it is interesting a greater percentage of editors indicated personal experiences and those of others had an impact as we move from research (58%) to association (74%) editors. A somewhat similar movement occurred in the impact of social events. Editors of scholarly publications were most likely to identify people who influenced them: professional editors second; the two other editor groups well behind either of these.

Some research editors indicated sources of influence were irrelevant to the survey's intended purposes. "I am an editor -- not educator" said one. They frequently mentioned graduate study and colleagues and advisors had an impact on their work. Names of individuals who had an impact included Arthur Koestler and Thomas Kuhn. Rather than "external" people, immediate colleagues, dissertation research activity, and broad work careers were cited most frequently.

Editors of scholarly journals were more verbose, in contrast to the reticence and lack of information exemplified by research editors. This group defines its role broadly as providing linkages between the advancement of knowledge and practice. Their short answers mirror the synthesis of unique experiences, well-known scholars, and personal individual contacts. Representative are the following:

> Studying with Anne Anastasi; her emphasis on individual differences; discussion with colleagues, especially Peter Armocost,

> Bud Hodgkinson; experiences as a teacher of psychology; discussions with students, especially in the period of confrontation; reading in psychology (Horney, Sullivan, Fromm, Lewin), education (Chickering, Carnegie, etc.) confrontations over goverance issues.
>
> Bertrand Russell's, B. F. Skinner's and Carl Rogers' books (I know, I can't figure it out either). Association with Dr. C. L. Hall, my major professor in graduate school. My Appalachian environment from birth to 18 years of age.
>
> NDEA Institute, work as a counselor, work as a counselor educator, professional meetings and organization, work with colleague and counselors in the field, Rogers, Bandura, Homme, D. Baruch, A. Combs, Carkhuff, Krumboltz, Dinkmeyer, Faust, Dr. Verne Faust, Dr. Don Dinkmeyer, Dr. Joe Wittmer, Ms. Bellie Jackson.
>
> My parents and homelife. Esther Lloyd Jones at Columbia U. My experience in student personnel work before going back for a doctorate. The great amount of reading I did -- too much to list -- when I was on leave for two years. The Bible.

Though some mentioned more personal experiences such as "depth discussions at professional meetings, four children and a beautiful marriage"; or "several excellent leaders in graduate school"; scholarly editors suggest integrated wholeness and meaning from many disparate sources. The meaning transferred from these pastiches influence their assumptions. There they believe impact their behaviors as editors.

Professional editors are more likely to develop notions based on their professional experiences. For example:

> My own role as chief negotiator and school administrator. Teacher militancy, various conservative books and publications.
>
> My experience as Executive Director of ________ and in teaching professional courses in Adult Education have combined to make me realize that we must do more to provide leadership in the field so that every person has the opportunity to advance as far as he or she can educationally.
>
> A variety of experiences as a teacher of young children in various parts of the U.S. and in various types of setting (day care, college lab school, etc.). Experiences with educators and professional (i.e., psychiatrists, etc.) who spent a great deal of time helping me to become acquainted with their thinking and the views of "authorities."

> Years of teaching, the depression and World War II, Norman Thomas, George Counts, Thomas Moran, the Thread that Runs so True, 1984, Ten Days that Shook the World--On the Beach.

> Unrepresentative is the following:

> Much influenced by John Dewey and other leaders of progressive education movement (Harold Rigg, Laura Zirbes, Marie Rosey, Earl Kelley). Also by phenomenological and humanistic psychologists (Arthur Combs, Hadley Cantril, Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers). Also by child-development-oriented proponents of early childhood education - James L. Hymes, Jr. Also by creative artists, in education (Dewey and Rugg again). I believe strongly in education through art.

Some members of this grouping also suggest that they are not educators. "I am an editor, not an educator. My role is to communicate what educators are doing, not to promote my own ideas." "I am not an educator. I am a Journalist."

Editors of association publications though individually often not sharing the integrated visions based on meanings derived from experiences, national scholars, and locally important people which characterize scholarly editors as a group do mention both personal and ideational contacts. For example:

> First, my association with the lady who was my predecessor. Her knowledge, guidance, patience and other qualities, although influenced by pain, were invaluable to me both before and after her death. Second, working with various boards, seeing their intent and how to achieve their goals.

> Probably experiences with people rather than books or theorists -- living in urban ghetto, working with various ethnic groups, spending some time in third world countries. Knowing wise people who were unschooled and people who were hurt because they were uneducated.

> I'm a tenth-grade dropout. I have eight children who will, please God, do better than Dad. I have talked to many students and many educators.

> I'll cop out on this one as I've only been involved with educational journalism about 8 months and am still getting used to the ballpark.

The Aims of Education - Whitehead, Teacher in America - Jacques Barzun, The Art of Teaching -- Gilbert Higaet, The User or the Past - Herbert Muller.

Sidney Marland's emphasis on career education.

The experiences mentioned are more personalistic than professional except for those who indicate professional journalism experiences. The following, more integrated view is rare:

> My own experience and observation while in school and later in adult life outside of school, my observation of my own children and my reading of such writers as Lewis Mumford, Eric Fromm, Martin Buber, and Simone de Beauvoir.

Many role occupants have their professional behavior carefully shaped and nurtured through educational programs and apprenticeships. "Editing" however is a somewhat different role: for many, a reward for a successful carreer in education; for others a staff position demanding journalistic talent, but not an area consciously demanding substantive process and skill preparation. The events and people shaping our respondents ideas do not clearly correspond to their role behavior qua editor as they do to notions held as educators. These notions are more likely to be shaped from professional working and educational experiences and less from educational philosophies.

We also asked our respondents to identify "contemporary thinkers in the field of education who share your perspective on the nature and function of education." Editors of research journals were the least informative of the four categories, for whatever reason - seeming irrelevance of the question or inability to answer it. Among the few names mentioned were B. O. Smith, James Coleman, Nevitt Sanford, Ralph Tyler, and Marshall McLuhan.

The most informative categories were the scholarly and professional editors, who might be hypothesized to have wider contacts with the literature of the broad field of education. Respondents in these groups identified "local" colleagues, experienced in graduate school settings and in work situations; they also identified current thinkers in the areas of their journal's content (e.g., higher education). Fewer mentioned those who could be classified as philosophers of education. Further, little overlap occurs among those mentioned by any one individual.

Among scholarly editors, Harry Broudy, Carl Rogers, and B. F. Skinner and Harold Hodgkinson are suggested more than once, with lone identification of such individuals as Malcolm Knowles, Lawrence Kohlberg, Jean Piaget, Mortimer Adler, Abraham Maslow, Robert Ulrich, Lawrence Cremin, and Robert Hutchins. A "higher education" respondent indicates, "Patricia Cross, Esther Lloyd-Jones, David Riesman, Harold Hodgkinson, Ernest L. Boyer, and Samuel Gould." As one compares the responses of this category with those of others, it seems to have identified individuals who have the broadest notions generally to the field. Research editors identified individuals representing intellectual perspectives or delimited areas of educational thought. Scholarly editors, though with their share of "locals," frequently indicated either less powerful professional thinkers or broad philosophers.

Editors of professional journals suggested some individuals who had shared professional experiences but were likely to mirror the responses of the scholarly editors. The broader thinkers identified include Daniel Bell, Piaget, Robert Hutchins, Erik Erickson, Charles Silberman and Margaret Mead, Carl Rodgers, Paul Goodman, and John Gardner. The somewhat more delineated individuals - William Glasser, J. Lloyd Trump, Jerome Kagan, John Holt, Albert Bandura - were also included. Interestingly, B. F. Skinner was not mentioned by professional editors, though more conservative thinkers are not entirely excluded (e.g., S. I. Hayakawa and Max Rafferty).

Editors of association publications were not as helpful in identifying key individuals, though were more enlightening than research editors. Although they frequently mentioned individuals on the staffs of the associations in which they were employed, the names of Christopher Jencks, Robert Hutchins, Max Rafferty, Henry Steele Commager, Abraham Maslow, and Piaget do appear.

Individual editors regardless of category are likely to identify clusters of individuals who share common characteristics, whether philosophical or professional orientations. Though breadth is represented within the categories identified, few individuals have responses as broad as these of a scholarly editor: "Harry Broudy, Robert Hutchins, B. F. Skinner, William Brickman, and Carl Rogers."

Further, a high percentage of our respondents declined to address this question. Fifty-eight percent of research editors, forty-eight percent of the scholarly, forty-one percent of the professional, and fifty-six percent of the associational publication gatekeepers failed to address this question. Of interest, the professional category, the lowest of the non-respondents, also finds more individuals naming larger cohorts of contemporaries with shared ideas.

Those listed are worthy of attention. Few formal philosophers of education, a substantial number of persons of local significance, and individuals of solid reputation in specialized areas of education are cited. There are a larger number of developmentally oriented psychologically based persons and critics of education from a more liberal bent than individuals representing other disciplines or spokesmen for a more conservative approach to education.

Future of Education

The authors had an interest not only in the sources of editor's ideas and some indication of their current embodiment, but also wanted to develop an understanding of editors notions of the future of education and the relationships between publication purposes and those futures.

We asked the editors, "What do you anticipate for the futures of education in the next 15 years?" We provided sixteen short lines for the responses which could have been listed or more fully developed. We indicated we were interested in more than one view by using the word "futures" twice in the instructions.

Before examining the actual responses, we will note the frequency of responses to the query by respondent category. We were interested not only in the actual count but in the level of response (i.e., whether editors addressed futures of the individual, of the institution or organization, or within a cultural framework). Besides tabulating editors responses we provided extra credit (three points) to an editor for each level used. Thus an editor who mentioned new curricula and governance patterns received five points while one who mentioned these plus new funding priorities by state governments would receive nine points. We believe that the index established would suggest editors' differentiation, breadth, ability to see the whole picture. Integration could occur, we posited, to some degree within the pages of the publications.

A progressive increase occurred in non-responses to this query: association (17%), professional (22%), scholarly (30%), research (50%) editors. More association editors listed up to three futures. This was more similar to the research group than was true for the professional and scholarly editors. Twenty-five percent of each of these latter categories mentioned between five and nine futures.

When research editors indicated futures, they mentioned those focusing on the individual learner more than did the other respondents. Seventeen percent of the research editors, compared to fourteen percent of the scholarly, seven percent of the professional, and nine percent of the associational were in this category. The slight edge might be attributed to the greater "psychological" base of the research group.

The institutional level was most often referred to by the associational publication editors, not an unlikely pattern given the close relationship between agencies and "schools." Eighty-eight percent of associational, seventy-four percent of professional, sixty-two percent of scholarly and forty-two percent of research editors mention items fitting this category. Research and association editors are likely to have fewer responses.

Research and scholarly editors might be assumed to consider the cultural or broader social implications of educational futures; this, however, was not the case. Each category had between a twenty and twenty-five percent response rate, except for association editors for whom it was about seventy percent. Association editors, might be more cognizant of the constraints of the social system on education since they are located on interfaces between social systems and institutions.

The authors also focused on the editors' ability to differentiate, to view the world of education in heterogeneous terms. There is a rich literature which relates "differentiation" to higher levels of human development and cognitive functioning. There is also a linkage between ability to differentiate and ability to recognize problems.

There is a different non-response rate for each category, and an editor's minimum score is four (one item plus one category). The highest score was eighteen, held by one professional and one associational editor.

The percentages of editors with scores of nine and above follows:

TABLE 17

Editor's Differentiation Ability

Score	R	S	P	A
9 and above (%)	25.0	37.8	34.3	56.0
10 and above (%)	25.0	32.4	25.7	34.6
15 and above (%)	0	6.4	4.4	4.3

The data indicate that research editors have lower differentiation scores, suggesting less breadth in their perceptions of the futures of education, a narrower focus which is supported by other data in the survey. Editors of scholarly publications who are able to integrate personal and professional experiences and wide reading into their descriptions of impactful events demonstrate the highest percentage of high scores, with editors of association publications demonstrating very broad range. Though less "cosmopolitan" than other editors, their breadth may be facilitated in agencies which address social issues and priorities, as well as their journalism background which socializes students to be aware.

This analysis treats the data relatively and does not suggest optimal scores. However, only eight of the ninety-six respondents have scores of fifteen and above. This is not cause for rejoicing.

Turning our attention to the substance of the perceived futures, it should be noted that the editors, regardless of category, represent publications in a variety of substantive areas. Thus, perceptions of the future will be influenced by their topical orientations (e.g., school boards, counseling and guidance).

Research editors, on the whole, use such key words as "continuing," "alternatives," "linkages," in their brief comments on the future. Pessimism does not abound except as "strife," "rising costs," and "decreasing enrollments." Two commentaries follow:

> More varigated educational institutions, individual use of information, technology will increase, erosion of narrow concept of institutional authority, institutions becoming less important as culture transmitters.
>
> Growing emphasis on recurrent education, vocational education alternatives more available, greater diversity of teaching and learning options.

There is a broad concern for "learning," positive affective tone, and familiarity with notions expressed in education circles concerning the future of the institution. A note of "progressive" or "continuous" is apparent. The possibility of abrupt change, resulting from exogeneous factors, such as the economy, is not addressed.

Comments by scholarly editors are fuller discussions of the future, though substantively similar to the reactions of research gatekeepers:

> Return to basic subject emphasis, international emphasis, equality of opportunity, better financial support, closer scrutiny of educational process, greater stress on culture, improved vocational training, more efficient use of resources, stress on inservice teacher education, acceptance of independent study, acceptance of external degrees, fewer administrators, more refined accredidation processes.
>
> More open classrooms, more community involvement through community education centers, more use of differentiated staffing, more specialists and paraprofessionals, more sophisticated technical equipment, more personalization and specialization, shades of future shock--Toffler. Greater emphasis on early childhood and elementary school levels, with increased flexibility at secondary level -- if it still exists, more university-school district cooperation.

These comments suggest the higher differentiation scores of these editors. In addition, there is a tone of "realism," tempered visions:

> Increased goal ambiguity and focus difficulty followed by relative calm from external pressures. Re-merging of administrators and teachers except in, and perhaps also in large urban centers. Secondary schools to operate more like 4-year colleges. Increased investments in developing human resources (teachers and administrators) rather than materials.
>
> Population concentrations, genetic manipulation, parts-replacement medicine cybernetic control of production, massive controls via drugs and communications, instant world-wide communications, easy world-wide transportation, world-wide transportation, world culture, somewhat nationalized, rapid change in societal and personal values, lifelong education and career retraining, little work and lots of leisure, flexible family patterns.
>
> Problems -- financing, control, program.
>
> I'm a firm believer in the proposition that educational change is evolutionary, not revolutionary. I would predict that the current emphasis (fads, schools of thought, or whatever) on (1) behavioristic approaches to schooling (e.g., behavior mod.) and (2) humanistic (e.g., "open" education) will still be with us, but that their confrontation will lead to some improved aspects of teaching and organization, and to a better understanding of children.
>
> Accountability -- resulting in improved cost accounting. Competency based teacher education--resulting in nothing, return to personal interest education--diminishing return to vocational emphasis--diminishing optional school systems--collapsing return to "fundamental" in "basic" education--reinforced basic survival of current unit--subject to what ever fads or criticism may become popular.

The most "innovative" comment is from the following editor:

> No school as we know it now, community centered learning matrix, home-centered instruction (media packages) life-long education for all, more attention to leisure rather than work, learner built curriculum, more dependence on the "new learning centers" for a myriad of personal and community goals.

Scholarly gatekeepers have cosmopolitan orientations and indicate that change occurs through confrontations arising from subsystem interaction.

Editors of professional publications highlight directions in "instruction." Dealing with manuscripts focusing explicitly with current practices and problems of educators, their views may be most well-grounded. These comments are representative:

> Vocational education will become a fact in elementary school. At the same time, more emphasis will be placed on personality development. The "higher nature" of man will receive more training and less apology. Teachers will become more militant and then more professional. The techniques of special education will be applied to all education. Parents will become more involved in education. Re-education will increase for adults. Equality of school financing will become an actuality.
>
> Computer assisted instruction, continuous progress, individualized instruction, learning packages, futuristic studies, open schools, voucher system, learning bases upon learning objectives, community educations, increased professionalism by greater professional control of education, participative management, open climates, increased flexibility, closing down of the "mass education school" and replacing with the naturalized school.

There is a concern for the consumer in education and "education for living."

> The increased realization that education is a continuing process throughout life and that education must serve a wide range of individuals from the gifted to the disadvantaged, from the young to the elderly--that learning should be recognized no matter how it occurs, traditionally or nontraditionally. Next 15 years: Some institutions will disappear and a new "learning society" will emerge.
>
> Growing emphasis on training for living -- i.e., values education, consumer education; career education; aesthetics education. More general acceptance of need to individualize instruction at early levels and cultivation and refinement of tools necessary to achieve this end.

Further, there is an anticipated positive involvement of the larger community - as resource and recipient.

> In spite of the many hurdles, road blocks, etc. -- especially financial problems, an educated and intelligent citizenry will continue to improve the effectiveness of our effort to educate

> all the people and thus achieve an intelligent populace which will not become enslaved by the forces which educate only the elite and hope thus, to gain world domination.
>
> A clearer definition of greater community school responsibilities and involvement and greater use of community resources. Open school and open campus concepts.

Some of the seasoned voices are less hopeful:

> Continuing cycles -- enrollments, problems, solutions, fads, controversies, public role and response, etc. Most of the things that concern us now concerned us at various times in the past and will again in the future.
>
> I've been around for more than 20 years and despite all the furor over "innovations" I don't see much change in the educational process. Can't see much change for the future except a worsening of the financial problems. If teacher negotiations gain a real voice for teachers in decision making, maybe some good things will happen, maybe not.

The comments of editors of association publications reflect issues in the environment-school nexus.

> Greater involvement of the business community in funding elementary and secondary education. Rearrangement of educational priorities with noneducators exercising increasing control over the local school and over training of teachers. Greater coordination among present separated areas (elementary, secondary and graduate schools).
>
> I anticipate professional educators (teachers) taking from the lay public control of the local schools. I believe firmly in the need to retain public schools in the hand of elected lay public--parents (non-parents) -- through school boards in each district.
>
> More federal support and control. More of a standardized curriculum, nationwide. A more humanized education establishment. A broader, life oriented school system. . . .

There is also a pessimistic thread running through the reactions ;

> a fairly rugged adjustment when federal funds decrease and local funds aren't available. A drive for career education, with accompanying confusion as to its meaning and role.
>
> Basically, same issues being rediscovered nothing earth shaking, same mixture of good and bad schools, wastefulness and penury.
>
> Money pinch, crowded classes, dropping enrollments, more depersonalization.
>
> Changes in society in general have been major, and for me, often unforeseen in this past decade. Upheaval, challenge, and change will be the condition of education for the forseeable future. I cannot predict the future of education any more than I can predict the future of society. I hope changes will reflect a reality that education can and does take many different forms ranging from living life to taking formal instruction, that a wide diversity of human needs exist for it to serve, and that it has inherent value but isn't a cure for the ills of the world.

Although there are many similarities when individual and grouped responses from editors are compared, there are differences which will be discussed in the implications section of this report. Suffice it to say, at this point, that both research and association publication editors may be too heavily influenced by the more circumscribed realities within which they are located to develop comprehensive, measured perspectives. Research editors are too far removed and association editors too involved to understand, or at least, like the examiners of the proverbial elephant, see the part as the whole, and the present as the future.

It is impossible to know whether these predicted futures are more descriptive or more normative statements of conditions which might obtain fifteen years hence. Are they based on defensible indicators or dreams? They seem to be, on the whole, within a "liberal" perspective, in substance and in temper. They speak to emerging flexibility, progressive developments, life-long learning, and the meeting of individual needs. There are not radical observations. The most different are the more pessimistic ones which reflect exogeneous factors which might have significant impacts on education.

This section of the research concluded with the question: "What functions do you believe your publication ought to play with regard to the futures you anticipate?"

We did not provide categories which the respondents could check but developed them upon the actual responses. The survey instrument provided five six-inch lines for reaction and the answers were coded into as many of the categories as were appropriate. The categories are: to report, inform, alert, or reflect; to critique, warn, or expose; to promote action; an "association" orientation; no relationship between futures and functions desired; to provide "relief"; and a scholarly or disciplinary dissemination function.

Research editors gave highest mention in the twelve responses to those which reflected disciplinary and scholarly dimensions. The second highest mention suggests the reporting function.

> Continue to publish research reports which have implications for the field of practice.
>
> Continue to present reports of research which have interpretations for the field.
>
> Promote scientific study and careful evaluation of innovations, change in college, impact of environment, etc.

These responses not only lack substance and depth but suggest assumptions held by research editors regarding the relationships between theory or research and practice. Though it would be this group, if any, who would be familiar with the literature in knowledge dissemination and utilization, such was not reflected.

One respondent questioned our assumption that there is a relationship between personal perspective and journal practices.

> What I anticipate for the future should in no way dictate the journal in terms of the substantive content of articles.

Of the fifty-three responses by scholarly editors, forty-six were classified in three categories: reporting, critiquing, and promotive action; half were in the first area and the other half evenly divided between the others.

> I see ... as a vehicle for presenting different sides of educational issues and reasoned analysis of educational trends. Our function, I think, is to make available the intellectual fodder for the enlightenment of the professional readership.
>
> Discuss the issues, take positions (let authors do this). We use theme issues so we may discuss topics from various angles. Reflect social change through selections of issues themes and special articles.

> To breach walls, disperse boundaries, and reach beyond that which is sheltering in ideas. Prowl for enlightened thinkers, seek vehicles for new spheres and dimensions with the progression. The editor must prowl.
>
> To be the vehicle for our organization for advancement of educational planning as a recognized discipline and to provide alternative models for decision-making for educational futures.
>
> Stimulate and encourage creative ideas, describe and discuss how theory can be put into practice, suggest gains by publishing evidence of effective practice, challenge the professional membership and its organized leadership to progressively act on issues, to enhance the profession's contributions and potential.
>
> Alerting educators and citizens about the nature of change, preparing them to thwart or redirect some projections not compatible with democracy, helping them to prepare psychologically, professionally, and citizenshipwise for the future.

Activity, restlessness, on a cognitive level, are suggested by these responses. Strong verbs are used. As research editors assume a relationship between scholarship and practice, so these editors believe that active thinking, considerations of new viewpoints, will assist readers in professional development and effectiveness.

If editors of scholarly journals will publish to report, inform, alert or reflect, so editors of professional journals, though giving this category highest consideration, give relatively more support to the promotion of action. Though a wide range of responses is noted in the data, there is a decided "operational" flavor speaking clearly to specific professional directions.

> Prompting readers to take an active interest in legislation affecting young children. Educating parents of preschoolers about different ways to handle their children. Teachers expressing their views and aims. Suggestions for multicultural curriculum in preschools. Making preschool education a happy experience from which children emerge feeling good about themselves.
>
> It ought to support, define and enlarge upon adult and continuing education.
>
> I believe the Journal should publicize the non-traditional approaches that already exist in institutions so these may be evaluated by those in and out of the field. This could contribute to the trends noted above.

> To cite some probably futures in which youth might find themselves and school people must be ready to react and act upon these premises.
>
> We must continue to help classroom teachers do their work as effectively as possible; to do better the things they all do.
>
> Inform its readers about the issues (pro & con) so they can make intelligent decisions.
>
> Presentation of trends as they occur. Examination and weighing of outcomes of various attempts to implement new strategies. Stress on the practical knowledge required by school boards to fulfill their responsibility to children and electorate.

Although greater emphasis is placed on action in the responses of professional journal editors, in comparison with the other respondent categories, the strength of the words used to describe these actions is not high. In examining the responses (not necessarily those included above) such words as "encouraging," "generating," "cover" (workable ideas), "design," "help," predominate amid a sprinkling of a more exciting verbiage: "stretch," "inspire."

Editors of association publications provide less weight to serving associational interests to emerging futures than might be expected. Only five of the thirty-three responses had a direct association orientation, while fifteen responses spoke to the informative function.

Seemingly, the reporting function is somewhat differently interpreted by editors of professional and associational media. Professional editors want to "present trends," "inform readers about issues," "illuminate the issues," "present ideas and attitudes," while association gatekeepers "report."

> Publicizing trends and goals in these areas as they develop.
>
> It should report actions and views of these things as they develop.

But even more, this reporting is for some editors, related to larger responsibilities.

> We should be the press agents for the changes that problems in our society suggest might be helpful, desirable, or essential--by reporting on and probing the problems and planting seeds of ideas for change.

> To spot and report trends, to create a climate for change among educators themselves, and to keep reminding educators that children are our reason for being, not problems to be avoided when possible.

Some indicate this reporting-improvement relationship is furthered by not making issues more complex, which might be the responsibility of scholarly editors, but to simplify them.

> Fully, fairly inform people about the latest developments in education in our state; keep the deceit and jargon to a minimum.

> Making education more understandable to the public and increasing citizen involvement. Eventually a primary source of public information about elementary and secondary education in New York.

"Journalists with a mission" seems to capture the essence of the associational editor; investigative reporting seems to be the strategy. In congruence with others in different categories, they seem not to reflect critically on their ability to serve the interests they enunciate.

Interviews

Our interviews with eight editors, representing all respondent categories in a variety of educational application areas, addressed many of the questions the survey initially raised. Given the limitations of space in this report, only a summary of the data will be presented here.

The interviewees, who it will be recalled, were chosen because of the relative excellence of their publications and interest in completing the survey, identified family backgrounds and professional relationships which they believed related to their operational philosophies of educators. Strong, positive parental relationships and the tutelage of influential educators were not uncommon. But of especial interest are the breadths of the editors, their highly differentiated functioning and their integration of personal agendas, professional role commitments, and social and educational issues orientations through the publications edited. The commitment is not so much to a substantive orientation as it is to a processual one. Further, through this commitment to "process" these cosmopolitans gain influence which they recognize as a strong personal need.

The most efficient method for presenting evidence of their orientations, and possibly the most effective, is through the dialogue of the interviews. The following discussion from one interview will set the stage, to be supplemented with briefer sections from others: (Scholarly editor)

> ...So I will see somebody who uses a Skinnarian approach very effectively and say maybe I could use it less effectively. But, I'm sure I could use part of the idea, and I guess I end up with a fusion or melding of lots of lots of peoples' ideas and never am quite confident that there is any single approach to something as complex as changing human behavior, mine or others, so I think in terms of an accretion process that I am modified a little bit and modify others and there is always this dynamic equilibrium, and there is no one approach to something as complex as society or as complex as the individual. One of the frustrating things about me is that I don't have a cause that is sufficient to lead me to a white horse. I don't know what makes me change or what makes others change. There is the survival kind of thing. If you have a large family and live in a large metropolitan area, you do some things that are necessary for survival and you work in an institutional setting where you don't have tenure....This organization is not maintained to provide me with a job, so just the survival thing is a major factor in change. I would hope truly that the thing that makes me change is that I'm enriched by reading and experiences and contacts with other people so that my field of vision is broadened and my perceptions are broadened and my sensitivities are deepened.
>
> My causes are global rather than discrete. I believe in mankind. I believe in kids and their self-fulfillment. I believe that they have to have certain kinds of characteristics and competencies, but I don't care if they are mine. I don't insist that my way is the only way. I would like to be in a position to help people find themselves and their own aspirations and their own strategies for obtaining those aspirations.
>
> ....there's something called ambition that leads me at least to want to be different, different in the sense that I don't want to be one of two million people in the country who are engaged in education.
>
> I want to be one of the few who has the visibility and I don't know if it's power or not. It's not power in the political sense, but I guess ambition to an extent is based upon the desire to get recognition of one's peers....
>
> I would like to know who the 100 influential people are (in my field) and I would like to know what influences them to change. Then be enabled to move the journal into a more activist role or influential role....

> First of all, I have to try to be effective as a human being, not likeable, but an effective human being - economically, socially. I have to know enough about my professional field so that I can make some decisions that are sound in terms of what we know and believe. I have to know enough about the communications process to make decisions and make some sense there, and I have to know enough about the technical aspects of the publication - so that I can supervise and monitor the work of other people....I want to be perceived as a leader. I would be disappointed if I saw my work as a contributor to the mass of paper around the world.

Another editor (research) comments.

> I wish I had at times more passions about specific areas. In other words, I am not opinionated enough in certain areas.... In my field a lot of people that I'm really hardnosed and hard-headed, and it's not really true. It just seems that way in public view, but I tend to be more understanding with authors of manuscripts than the consultants are. I envy them their luxury of being able to really jump on something or not jump on it.
>
> ...If I were in a bookstore I would just head to, one, the contemporary fiction section, the other is what they are using for textbooks in areas like the history and philosophy of science. I just want to know....I suppose if I were to pick out one phrase to have them say about me, it would be that he was the Renaissance man of the field. I would like that. Don't think they will because the guy who was, died (his mentor).
>
> ...the professional recognition is very important...I also like the opportunity of being able to know what is going on, of getting input from all directions. Also, the opportunity to help shape the directions in which the field moves, and in that sense I feel almost an obligation as well as a desire to do it because whoever is editor of the journal has quite a bit to say about it.

A research editor indicates in describing how he was chosen editor over a well-known specialist.

> "He (the appointer) said I have got to have somebody who understands the balance between all the forces involved and who can make it go and ---- couldn't do that. He is an extremely competent person, but he also would have an

> extremely narrow view of the role to be performed, and I think also a fairly narrow view of what is acceptable in research."

This editor had made a number of career shifts - from teaching to administrative - and at 58 who had just made another move.

A professional editor after working for United Press International and wanting to be an airline pilot, in addition to other career choices, commented on his editorship.

> "I think this total involvement in the broad picture (is what 'turns' me on). It's not localized at all. It's so encompassing that even the subject is interesting because of its national, almost international, implications that definitely has an appeal. The responsibility you think you have. The opportunity to influence people and make decisions that ultimately will influence people. This is very ego-gratifying. It's self-satisfying...just simply in determining there will be an issue every (administrator) in the country will focus on."

As this editor is oriented to more operational dimensions in education, one finds somewhat more focused thinking, a bit more difficulty dealing with broad educational themes. He was, for example, a "humanist" who had not heard of Carl Rogers. But he wanted to perceive himself as an educational statesman.

We found during an interview with an association editor of a vocational education department that much discussion focused on the nation's bicentennial and the planning of the state museum in developing displays for the event. This editor, trained in the ministry, was not unlike the rather rich backgrounds found in editors, another a former newspaper proprietor, spoke to highly differentiated contexts. The media provided the opportunity for the "packaging." Of course, the editor's commitment - from a process to a specific interest - related to the category in which he was located.

An editor's beliefs about the future and his interest and ability to prosecute these directions are dependent on ideosyncratic backgrounds, roles, and goals. The constant is a fully functioning individual who is attempting to create integration in his own life and in the lives of others through a professional identification.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS

Although an exploratory study, we expected editors' behaviors and attitudes to differ according to the journal types. Using descriptive statistics, response patterns do emerge in the large amount of data. It should be noted that this report does not present cross-tabular data, given the length of the report, and does not control by other categorizations, e.g., major readership. Further, working with the population of education journals, as opposed to a sample, we are concerned with significant differences that have behavioral, not statistical, meaning. We believe the four types of journals which were predicted and which emerged in somewhat different form do capture different orientations toward published communication in education.

In addition to major differences among editors in their behaviors and attitudes we believed there would be commonalities. We assumed they would be educators in the broadest sense, active, "fully-functioning," aware of themselves and their fields and participating meaningfully in the larger society. We expected awareness of editing processes and more important, an understanding of their implicit meaning. We assumed leadership, models who would provide professional guidance to both prospective authors and readers.

Though there are many editors individually who bore out our early assumptions and "scholarly journal editors" who as a category speak to them most clearly, there is evidence in both the surveys and the interviews which does not support our expectations. In examining the data, we find a narrowness, an insulation, a management orientation. We find that many editors seemingly have not carefully considered their role as educational gatekeeper.

Narrowness and insulation have different meanings considering the journal types. The research journal editor may perceive his values as irrelevant to his leadership role; professional editors may not belong to community organizations with social or cultural import; association editors may have distaste for scholarship and highly negative feelings for those who advance it.

There is insulation through the common failing both to indicate the publishing interests of the journals and to transmit the rationales for manuscript inacceptability. There is not broad field involvement in the selection of editors, either directly or indirectly through representatives. There is no open and fair competition for publication when high percentages of manuscripts are invited. In fact, the debate between sponsored and contest norms is not even at a primitive level in education publishing.

We indicated in the report that some interviewed editors view themselves ideally as renaissance men. They are involved in many facets of professional education, through their research, positions in professional societies, locations in prestigious universities. They have commitments to scholarship or problem-solving, broadly, and are not captives of a particular substantive paradigm or approach to problem-solving. It is their cognitive breadth, their cosmopolitanism, that seems to speak to an ability to serve in the editorial role and to meet the differential interests of authors, readers, publishers, reviewers, as well as their private concerns.

We found, however, that there is a thin line between renaissance functioning and marginality. As a lack of private commitments or an ability to withhold them from editorial functioning allow for better field service, so it also allows for "freshness" or poorly defined "reader interest" to guide. In fact, we found to a significant extent, editors chose material which interests them for the moment. They are the universal reader. Like the editor who defined himself as a humanist but was unfamiliar with Carl Rogers or the editor who attributed a current education book, which he was reading, to the wrong author, breadth is often at the expense of understanding and in our review uncommonly associated with it.

Leadership assumptions without the requisites, is understandable. Many editors who did not achieve recognition through their research are leaders by virtue of their ascribed, not earned position. They hold an organizational chair, position does not reside in them as it does for the true professional. The editor relates to those in his field who are among the most active and well-known; he sponsors their work; but he does not "have the credentials to be" considered among them. The editor might be brought into the highest councils of his field but often is not truly of it. This marginality, combined with a need to have influence, was perceived by the principal investigators during many interviews. One editor "referred" to his predicament when discussing his personal behavior. He remarked how he frequently sat in a Washington airport coffee shop to observe visiting dignataries who had just flown to the Capitol.

If marginality often exists in the professionals chosen to edit, the burden must also fall on the organizations which publish the journals. Editors in education settings often perform their role in addition to other significant administrative or teaching responsibilities. Typically, editors in associations or agencies are responsible for total information dissemination activities. Although professional reading and manuscript preparation take up so very much energy and are used to broadly as indicators of growth and development, as well as rewards, corresponding full-time commitments by editors are rare.

In fact, given the amount of resources with which editors are supplied, it is surprising that regularly published journals emerge. If it were not for the "healthy egos" which we interviewed, there probably would be fewer attempts to engage in such a volume of work with so few resources.

It is incumbent on the field to consider ways in which editors can and will be allowed to serve more adequately.

CHAPTER 9

RECOMMENDATIONS

We believe carefully considered editorial policy is crucial to the field's future health and actual direction. Although many editors serve well, there are limited opportunities for collegial discussion given the location of editors in different settings.

Editors may be advised occasionally by boards or association directors and may receive letters from the field but we found interest in limited field relations for accountability purposes by our interviewees. In fact, it is our observation that frequently educators are uncertain as to the type of interaction appropriate when with an editor.

It is our opinion there should be opportunities for editors to meet in workshop settings to learn appropriate skills, gain new understandings, and consider in a non-threatening atmosphere the policy and larger substantive dimensions of their work.

We believe the need is perceived equally by the incumbents, given the high response rate to our survey and the eagerness of those we interviewed to share perspectives on their professional role.

The workshops could be designed for the editor groups identified in this research. Research journal editors might consider value question in education, consider their normative positions, approach areas in the philosophy of science (e.g., the value implications of methodologies), and become more fully acquainted with publishing technology. Scholarly journal editors might examine questions of knowledge utilization; professional journal gatekeepers might address new technologies of knowledge dissemination for the practitioner with problem-solving needs. Association journal editors could learn to be more receptive to and understanding of the substantive bases of the field.

These more focused areas in relation to larger policy issues, even moving to remedial approaches within areas to improve manuscript quality, could allow for more accountable, effective, and efficient operation.

There is a great deal more research which could inform our understanding of information dissemination and utilization in education. The present research tells us how editors perceive their decision making. More in-depth studies of how choices are made by focusing on specific manuscripts would provide operational data which in correspondence with the perceptual, would allow for better understanding and intervention potentials.

Surveys of journal readership which focus on media related interests and use would allow for consideration of alternative approaches to knowledge dissemination relating to behavioral needs.

In addition to workshops for editors, especially important given the turnover and immediate, significant issues with which they must deal, and further research focusing on editor behavior and reader need, the field must consider new patterns of information dissemination.

Many editors interviewed believed their journals had limited impact, in spite of the energy devoted to publication. Clearly differentiated in education are informal and journal approaches to meeting professional need. Conferences and personal contact characterize a form of relationship which should be considered more seriously by the field in addressing publishing approaches. For example, a scholarly journal might publish an article with accompanying dialogue from invited readers initially and others after publication. Research articles could promote dialogue by including the critiques of published manuscripts. Professional editors could publish seminars on brief accounts of professional practice, inviting those with experience to comment on these approaches to problem-solving.

Currently, we publish "contributions," the notion of completeness, of self-sufficiency, of perfection is assumed. This posture is oriented to reader closure, not openness to different interpretations of what is presented. Journal publishing, the brief article, is not oriented to reader discovery and growth. It does not foster cognitive complexity. In fact, it promotes subservience to authority, regardless of its adequacy.

The most crucial decision for the field is to perceive a need to look critically at knowledge dissemination activities. Once movement is taken in this direction by various educational associations, readers and research agencies, prospects for improvement will be set in motion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, Chris. *The Applicability of Organizational Sociology*, Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Barber, Bernard, et al. "The Structure of Scientific Competition and Reward and its Consequences for Ethical Practices in Bio-Medical Research." Paper delivered at 67th Annual Meeting of American Sociological Association, New Orleans, 1972.

Bass, Abraham Z. "Refining the Gatekeeper Concept: A UN Radio Case Study," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1969, 46:69-72.

Baumol, William J. and Peggy Heim. "On Contracting with Publishers: or What Every Author Should Know." *AAUP Bulletin*, Spring, 1967:30-43.

Blau, Judith. "The Structure of Interpersonal Relations Among Theoretical High Energy Physicists." Paper presented at 68th meeting, American Sociological Association, New York, 1973.

Boalt, Gunnar. *The Sociology of Research*, Southern University Illinois Press, Carbondale, 1969.

Bowen, Donald D., Robert Perloff, and Jane Jacoby. "Improving Manuscript Evaluation Procedures." *American Psychologist*, March 1972:221-225.

Brackbill, Y. and Korten, F. "Journal Reviewing Practices: Authors' and APA Members' Suggestions for Revision." *American Psychologist*, 1970, 25:937-940.

Bragg, Ann K. and G. Lester Anderson. *Journals of Education for the Professions*. Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1974.

Cahnman, Werner J. "For the Abolition of the Anonymity Rule." *The American Sociologist*, May, 1967:97-98.

Carter, Roy E., Jr. "Newspaper 'Gatekeepers' and the Source of News," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1958, 22:133-144.

Chase, Janet M. "Normative Criteria for Scientific Publication." *American Sociologist*, V, August 1970:262-265.

Christopherson, Victor A. "Publication and Higher Education: Correlates and Implications." *Social Science*, Vol. 43. January 1968:29-37.

Cole, Stephen and Jonathan R. Cole. "Visibility and the Structural Bases of Scientific Research." *American Sociological Review*, 33, June 1968:397-413.

Cole, Stephen and Jonathan R. Cole. "Scientific Output and Recognition: A Study in the Operation of the Reward System in Science." American Sociological Review, 32, June 1967:377-390.

Crane, Diana. "The Gatekeepers of Science: Some Factors Affecting the Selection of Articles for Scientific Journals." The American Sociologist, II, 1967:195-201.

Crane, Diana. "Social Structure in a Group of Scientists: A Test of the 'Invisible College' Hypothesis." American Sociological Review, 34, June 1969, p. 335.

Crane, Diana. "Scientists at Major and Minor Universities: A Study of Productivity and Recognition." American Sociological Review, 30, October, 1965:699-714.

Deats, Tom. "Moving and Using Information." Teachers College Record, February 1974, 75:383-393.

Conohew, Lewis. "Newspaper Gatekeepers and Forces in the News Channel." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1967, 31:61-68.

Eidell, T. L. and Kitchel, Jim (Eds). Knowledge Production and Utilization in Educational Administration, University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio, 1968.

Eiduson, Bernice T. Scientists: Their Psychological World, Basic Books, 1962.

Erdos, P. Professional Mail Surveys. McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Forcher, Bernard K. "Rules for Referees." Science, Vol. 150, October 15, 1965:319-321.

Frantz, T. T. "Criteria for Publishable Manuscripts." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVIII, 1968:384-386.

Garvey, W. D. and Griffeth, B. C. "Scientific Communication: Its Role in the Conduct of Research and Creation of Knowledge." American Psychologist, 1971, 26:349-362.

Garvey, William D., et al. Some Comparisons of Communication Activities in the Physical and Social Science. Report #11, Center for Research in Scientific Communication, Department of Psychology, Johns Hopkins University, 1970 (mimeo).

Glenny, Lyman. The Anonymous Leaders of High Education. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1971.

Goudsmit, Samuel A. "What Happened to My Paper?" Physics Today, XXII, May 1969:23-25.

Gross, Edward. "Universities as Organizations." American Sociological Review, August 1968. Vol. 33, No. 4, p. 518-544.

Guetzkow, Harold. "Conversion Barriers in Using the Social Sciences." Administrative Science Quarterly, 4, June 1959.

Hagstrom, Warren. The Scientific Community, Basic Books, 1965.

Haskins, J. B. The Evaluation of Mass Communications. Advertisive Research Foundation (N.Y.), 1968.

Hefferlin, J. B. Lon and Ellis L. Phillips, Jr. Information Services for Academic Administrators. Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Hickey, James R. "The Effects of Information Control on Perception of Centrality." Journalism Quarterly, 1968, 45:49-54.

Hobbs, Walter and John Francis. "On the Scholarly Activity of Higher Educationalists." Journal of Higher Education, January 1973.

Hortung, A. B. and E. M. Lotta. "Professional Publication: The Editor's Side." Clearinghouse, October 1969, 44:104.

Kuhn, Thomas. Structure of Scientific Revolutions, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Ladd, Everett Caril, Jr. and Seymour M. Lipset. "Politics of Academic Natural Scientists and Engineers." Science, Vol. 176, No. 4039, 9 June 1972, p. 1091-1100.

Lakatos, Imre and Alan Musgrove, eds. Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge, Proceedings of the International Colloquium on the Philosophy of Science, London, N.Y. Cambridge University Press, Vol. 4, July 1965.

Lin, Nan, et al. A Study of the Communication Structure of Science, Report #10, Center for Research in Scientific Communication, Department of Psychology, Johns Hopkins University, 1970 (mimeo).

Lin, Nan and Carnot E. Nelson. "Bibliographic Reference Patterns in Core Sociological Journals." The American Sociologist, IV, 1969: 47-50.

Lin, Nan. "Information Flow, Influence Flow and the Decision Making Process." Journalism Quarterly, 1971, 48:33-40 ff.

Lodahl, Janice B. and Gerald Gordon. "The Structure of Scientific Fields and the Functioning of University Graduate Departments." American Sociological Review, Vol. 37, February 1972:57-72.

McNaul, James P. "Relations Between Researchers and Practitioners," in Nagi, Saad and Ronald Corwin, eds. The Social Contexts of Research, Wiley, 1972.

McNelly, John T. "Intermediary Communicators in the International Flow of News." *Journalism Quarterly*, Winter 1959, Vol. 36:No. 1, 23-26.

McReynolds, P. "Reliability of Ratings of Research Papers." *American Psychologist*, April, 1971, Vol. 26:No. 4, 400-401.

Marquis, Donald G. and Thomas J. Allen. "Communication Patterns in Applied Technology." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 21, No. 11, November 1966, p. 1052-1060.

Meehan, Eugene J. "Science, Values, and Policies." Paper delivered at 67th Annual Meeting of American Sociological Association, New Orleans, 1972.

Menzel, Herbert. "Scientific Communication: Five Themes from Social Science Research." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 21, No. 11, November 1966, p. 999-1004.

Merton, Robert K. "The Matthew Effect in Science." *Science*, January 1968:p. 56-63. Vol. 159, No. 3810.

Merton, Robert K. "Priorities in Scientific Discovery: A Chapter in the Sociology of Science." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, No. 6, 635-659, December, 1975.

Nagi, Saad and Ronald Corwin, eds. *The Social Contexts of Research*, Wiley, 1972.

Newman, S. H. "Improving the Evaluation of Submitted Manuscripts." *American Psychologist*, Oct, 1966, Vol. 21, No. 10:980-981.

Ohles, J. F. "Writing for Publication." *Clearinghouse*, 45, December 1970:245.

Page, Irving H. "Some Perils of Authorship." *Science*, April 1964, Vol. 144, No. 3615, p. 139.

Polanyl, Michael. *Personal Knowledge*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.

Polanyi, Michael. "Scientific Outlook: Its Sickness and Cure." *Science*, March 1957, Vol. 125, No. 3246, p. 480-484.

Price, Derek J. de Sola. "Ethics of Scientific Publication." *Science*, May 1964:Vol. 144, No. 3619:p. 655-657.

Price, Derek J. De Sola. "Invisible Colleges and the Affluent Scientific Community." Little Science, Big Science, N.Y., Columbia, 1963: 62-91.

Ravetz, Jerome R. Scientific Knowledge and Its Social Problems. Oxford University Press, 1971.

Reif, Fred and Anselm Strauss. "The Impact of Rapid Discovery Upon the Scientists's Career." Social Problems, 12, 3, 1965:297-311.

Rodman, Hyman. "Notes to an Incoming Journal Editor." American Psychologist, March 1970:269-273.

Rodman, Hyman. "The Moral Responsibility of Journal Editors and Referees." American Sociologist, November 1970:351-357.

Roe, Anne. "The Psychology of Scientists." The Management of Scientists, ed. Karl Hill, Beacon, 1964.

Rowe, A. P. "From Scientific Idea to Practical Use." Minerva, Vol. II, No. 3, Spring 1964, pp. 303-310.

Schaeffer, D. L. "Do APA Journals Play Professional Favorites?" American Psychologist, 1970, 25:362-365.

Schein, Edgar. Professional Education: Some New Directions, McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Shapere, Dudley. "The Paradigm Concept." Science, Vol. 172, No. 3984. May 1971:706-709.

Silverman, R. J. "Communication as the Basis for Disciplinary and Professional Development in Higher Education." Journal of Research and Development in Education, January 1973.

Smigel, Erwin O. and Laurence H. Ross. "Factors in the Editorial Decision." The American Sociologist, V, February 1970:19-21.

Smith, Alfred G. Communication and Status: The Dynamics of a Research Center, University of Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Eugene, Oregon, 1966.

Storer, Norman W. and Talcott Parsons. "The Disciplines as a Differentiating Force," in E. B. Montgomery, ed. The Foundation of Access to Knowledge: A Symposium, Syracuse, N.Y., Division of Summer Sessions, Syracuse, 1968:101-121.

Storer, Norman W. "Some Sociological Aspects of Federal Science Policy." American Behavioral Scientist, 1962, Vol. 6, 27-30.

Storer, Norman W. The Social System of Science, N.Y., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Strauss, Anselm and Lee Rainwater, The Professional Scientist, Aldine, 1962.

Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory, 14th and 15th Editions, R. R. Bowker Co., 1971, 1973.

Watson, James D. The Double Helix, Atheneum, 1968.

Westley, Bruce H. and MacLean, Malcolm S., Jr. "A Conceptual Model for Communications Research," Journalism Quarterly, 1957, Vol. 34, No. 1, Winter, 1957.

White, David Manning. "The 'Gate Keeper': A Case Study in the Selection of News." Journalism Quarterly, 1950, 27:383-390, Vol. 27, No. 1, Winter, 1950.

Whitley, Richard D. "The Formal Communications System of Science: A Study of the Organization of British Social Science Journals." The Sociological Review, Monograph No. 16, September 1970:163-179.

Whitley, Richard D. "The Operation of Science Journals: Two Case Studies in British Social Science." Sociological Review, New Series, Vol. 18, No. 2, July 1970:241-258.

Wolfe, Wirt M. "A Study of Criteria for Journal Manuscripts." American Psychologist, 25, July 1970:636-639.

Yoels, William C. "The Structure of Scientific Fields and the Allocation of Editorships on Scientific Journals." A paper presented at 68th meeting, American Sociological Association, New York, 1973.

Zuckerman, Harriet and Robert K. Merton. "Patterns of Evaluation in Science: Institutionalization, Structure and Functions of the Referee System." Minerva, January 1971, Vol. IX, No. 1:66-100.

Zuckerman, Harriet. "Nobel Laureates in Science: Patterns of Productivity, Collaboration and Authorship." American Sociological Review, 32, June 1967:391-403.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Dear Journal Editor:

We at the Office of Media Studies, Ohio State University, are conducting an intensive project, funded by the National Institute of Education, to investigate the roles and functions of editors of journals in education. You have been selected at random as one of a small but representative sample to participate in our research.

In a few days our questionnaire will reach you in a specially marked envelope. Because we know your time is limited we have made every effort to make the questionnaire as convenient as possible to complete by utilizing short answer and rating scale questions wherever feasible. Please be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidence.

We hope we can count on you to take part in our study. We believe that our research can provide an important contribution to the understanding of the publication process and can help to create an understanding of education as a field of study.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Silverman
Associate Professor

Erik L. Collins
Assistant Professor
Project Directors

APPENDIX B

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Dear Journal Editor:

Enclosed is the questionnaire on the roles and functions of editors of journals in education we wrote you about a few days ago. As mentioned in our earlier letter, you have been selected at random as one of a small sample of editors to participate in our research. Therefore it is extremely important that we obtain your views and opinions in order to make our study as complete as possible.

A brief look at the questionnaire will indicate the kinds of things we are interested in: your journal's editorial policies, your editorial responsibilities, and your views on the roles of educational journals and the future development of education in general. We know how valuable your time is. Therefore we have tried to keep the time needed to complete the questionnaire as short as possible. The questionnaire may seem a little complex but once you begin you will find that most answers require only a check mark or a one or two word response. Please be assured that your answers will be punched on cards and pooled with other responses so that data from any particular journal will not be identifiable.

Could we please have the completed questionnaire returned by March 27. A postage paid, self-addressed, return envelope has been provided for your convenience. We also would like a recent copy of your journal. There is sufficient postage to cover the cost of including the journal as well as the questionnaire. If you would like a copy of our results please check the box at the end of the questionnaire.

Thank you again for participating in our research.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Silverman

Robert J. Silverman
Associate Professor

Erik L. Collins

Erik L. Collins
Assistant Professor
Project Directors

APPENDIX C

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM
242 WEST 18TH AVENUE
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210

WILLIAM E. HALL, *Director*

Dear Editor:

We need your help. We haven't yet received the questionnaire about editors of journals in education we sent you several days ago. Since you are one of just a few editors chosen to participate in this study, it is extremely important that we obtain the information on editorial policies, roles and functions of journal editors that only you can provide.

The results of this study will be used to help us obtain a more accurate picture of the processes involved in journal editing and to provide basic information for future research that will aid in the development of education in general. Please be assured that your answers will be held in strict confidence.

Please take a little time now and complete as much of the questionnaire as you can. We have included a second questionnaire in case you might have mislaid the first one we sent you. A stamped, self-addressed, return envelope has been provided for your convenience.

Thank you.

Robert J. Silverman

Robert J. Silverman
Associate Professor

Erik L. Collins

Erik L. Collins
Assistant Professor

P.S. In case you have already returned the completed questionnaire, please disregard this letter and accept our thanks for your kind cooperation.

APPENDIX D

NAME

DATE

ADDRESS

COMMENTS

PHONE

Questionnaire received?	YES	NO	OTHER		
Questionnaire returned?	YES	NO	OTHER		
If no, why not?			TOO LONG	DIDN'T APPLY	PAST DEADLINE
			OTHER:		
Another questionnaire?	YES	NO			
If definitely won't complete, why?					
Send current journal?	YES	NO			

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX E

FORMAT OF PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Introductory remarks of the personal conversations included the following:

> Some information about the study: the relative lack of information about the process of publishing or information dissemination in Education, the large N, the breakdown into four theoretical categories, the process of interviewing representatives of each.

Interviewees were informed that the questions pertained to the mechanics of publication, their personal backgrounds, their roles as editors, and the futures of their publications specifically and information dissemination generally.

The personal interviews sought answers to the following questions:

I. MECHANICS

A. Who are the authors of material which your journal publishes?

1. Are they unsolicited? What percentage? Are these for certain "sections" or "departments"?
2. Are they solicited?
3. Where do the ideas for the materials originate?

B. Trace the "flow process" of material being considered for publication from the time it reaches your desk initially until a decision is made to use or reject it.

1. Who sees it (in order)?
2. Where are the critical decision points in accepting or rejecting a manuscript?
3. To what extent do you feel you have the latitude to accept or reject recommendations from those who see the material?
4. What is the degree of convergence?
5. What processes do you engage in personally?
6. Describe the nature of the feedback between yourself and those whose material is being considered? (Receipt of ms., readers' reactions, form letters.)
7. Describe the amount of editing performed on papers. Is it mostly grammatical or substantive as well?

C. If your journal has an editorial board

1. How do individuals become members of the Editorial Board? How do they "emerge"? What is your role in this?
2. Could you talk about your relationship with members of the Board?

3. Do you have meetings? (If yes)
    a. How are agendas set?
    b. What are their typical "content"?
    c. With regard to the decisions that are made, could you discuss typical Board actions?

D. Does your journal use "readers"?

1. If so, how are they chosen?
2. How many are there?

E. Could you talk about how policy is made for your publication?

1. What are your goals?
2. How have they changed since you assumed the editorship?
3. How would you like to see them altered in the next five years?

F. Please identify another journal which is competitive/similar to yours.

II. BACKGROUND

A. What things led up to your assumption of the editorship?

1. schooling
2. professional experiences
3. particular set of events

B. What qualifications did you believe you possessed which spoke to this role?

C. Having been engaged in editing, are there qualities which you have which relates to the success you have had with the publication?

III. ROLE

A. How do you see yourself?

1. How do you conceive of your role as editor in relation to your readers and to the institution of education? [Leader, Gatekeeper (mirror), Administrator]
2. What impact do you believe your publication has on its readers? What evidence do you have?

B. Does your editorship have Advantages and Disadvantages as you relate to your colleagues in your field?

C. How have you changed/developed professionally because of the editorship?

  1. Benefits and limitations vis a vis career goals.
  2. Who are your heroes in education? [get into "philosophy" of education]

IV. THE FUTURE

A. What needs to be done to improve your publication?

B. What could be done to improve the quality of manuscripts?

C. How should editors, editorial decision-makers, be trained?

D. What new communication media are needed in your specific field?

APPENDIX F

JOURNALS INCLUDED IN STUDY

Category 1 - Research Journal

- AV Communication Review
- College and University
- Comparative Education Review
- Journal of College Student Personnel
- Journal of Educational Measurement
- Journal of Educational Research
- Journal of Experimental Education
- Journal of Special Education
- Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance
- Research in Higher Education
- Southern Journal of Education Research
- Student Personnel Assn. for Teacher Education

Category 2 - Scholarly Journal

- AEDS Journal
- College Student Journal
- Colorado Journal of Educational Research
- Counseling and Values
- Elementary School Guidance and Counseling
- Elementary School Journal
- Education
- Education Tomorrow
- Educational Administration Quarterly
- Educational Forum
- Educational Perspectives
- Educational Record
- Focus on Guidance
- Graduate Journal
- Harvard Educational Review
- High School Journal
- Improving Human Performance
- Intellect
- International Journal of Instructional Media
- Journal of Continuing Education and Training
- Journal of Cooperative Education
- Journal of Education
- Journal of Extension
- Journal of General Education
- Journal of Higher Education
- Journal of Learning Disabilities
- Journal of Teacher Education
- NASPA Journal
- NAWDAC Journal

Category 2 - Scholarly Journal

New Directions for Higher Education
North Central Association Quarterly
Peabody Journal of Education
Perspectives
School Counselor
Secondary Education Today
Thrust
University College Quarterly
Viewpoints
West Carolina University Journal of Education

Category 3 - Professional Journal

AACS Bulletin
AAUP Bulletin
Administrator
AEN Bulletin
Alaska Teacher
American Secondary Education
American Vocational Journal
Arizona Teacher
CEFP Journal (Council on Educational Facility Planners)
California School Boards
Chalk Marks
Change
Childhood Education
College and University Business
College and University Journal
College Board Review
Community and Junior College Journal
Compact
Constructive Triangle
Early Years
Educating Children: Early and Middle Years
Educational Leadership
Educom
Illinois Journal of Education
Illinois Principal
Illinois School Board Journal
Illinois Schools Journal
Impact
Improving College and University Teaching
Instructor
Journal of Adult Education
Journal of Correctional Education
Journal of Educational Technology Systems
Journal of Outdoor Education
Journal on the Handicapped Child

Category 3 - Professional Journal

- Learning
- Maryland Teacher
- Massachusetts Teacher
- Media and Methods
- NAIS Report
- National Assn. of Secondary School Principals Bulletin
- Nation's Schools
- New York State Secondary Education
- New Voices in Education
- Ohio Elementary School Principal
- Oklahoma Teacher
- Parent Cooperative Preschools International Journal
- Pennsylvania School Journal
- Progressive Teacher
- Scholastic Teacher
- School Administrator
- School Management
- South Carolina Education Journal
- TEPSA Journal
- Texas Study of Secondary Education Research Bulletin
- Trend
- Virginia Journal of Education
- Young Children

Category 4 - Associational Journals

- Alabama School Journal
- Boardman
- CEA Advisor
- Core Teacher
- Education Dialogue
- Feedback
- Florida Schools
- Focus on Learning
- Inside Education
- Journal of Arkansas Education
- Mississippi Educational Advance
- Mississippi Educational Journal
- New Mexico School Review
- New York State School Boards Assn. Journal
- North Carolina Education
- North Dakota Journal of Education
- Ohio School Boards Journal
- Ohio Schools
- Open Door
- Oregon Education
- South Carolina Schools
- Teacher's Voice
- UEA Action

APPENDIX G

JOURNAL GATEKEEPER QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to assess how editors view their roles and functions as decision makers in the publication of educational (academic and professional) journals, as well as to obtain a descriptive picture of the individuals involved in the editorial processes.

First we would like to ask some questions about you and your publication.

1. When did you assume the editorship of your journal?

year

2. Had you previously served as a member of the editorial board or been a "reader" for your journal?

check one

yes ☐
no ☐

3. With what other journals and for what time periods have you served in some editorial capacity (e.g. "reader")?

none ☐

Journal	Capacity	Year
		19 to 19
		19 to 19
		19 to 19
		19 to 19
		19 to 19
		19 to 19

4. By what process were you chosen as editor of your journal?

check as many as apply

by the previous editor ☐
by the editorial board ☐
by the president or executive committee of professional organization ☐
by publications committee of a professional organization ☐
by the election of members of a professional organization ☐
by the commercial publisher of the journal ☐
by the university publisher of the journal ☐
other (please specify) ☐

5. What is the length of your term as editor?

check one

1 year ☐
2 years ☐
3 years ☐
4 years ☐
5 years ☐
6 years ☐
undefined in years ☐
other (specify) ☐

Is your term renewable?

check one

yes ☐
no ☐

6. What percentage of your total professional activities is devoted to the editorial role? %

If it is not 100%, what other role positions do you have?

7. What percent of the time you devote to editorial responsibilities is spent performing the following editorial duties?

reading manuscripts	%
corresponding and working with authors	%
communicating with editorial board members	%
managing the editorial office	%
working on business concerns (e.g. printer's contracts, publicity)	%
developing policy for the publication	%
copy editing manuscripts and galleys	%
other (specify)	%
	Totals 100%

IF YOUR JOURNAL DOES NOT HAVE AN EDITORIAL BOARD
PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 13.

8. How are editorial board members selected for your journal?

check as many as apply

appointed by the executive leadership of the association publishing the journal ☐
by the editor ☐
elected by professional association members (after nomination by publishing committee) ☐
direct appointment by publication committee of the professional organization ☐
direct election by professional association membership ☐
other (specify) ☐

9. What functions do members of the editorial board perform?

may check more than one

read and comment on manuscripts ☐
recommend action on manuscripts ☐
select manuscripts ☐
recommend policy ☐
determine policy ☐
make financial and business decisions ☐
other (specify) ☐

10. About how frequently does your editorial board meet?

check one

once every three months ☐
once every six months ☐
yearly ☐
bi-yearly ☐
never ☐
other (specify) ☐

11. How many days do the meetings of your editorial board last?

days

12. What criteria do you consider important in selecting members to your editorial board? Please rate the criteria listed below which are often taken into consideration in the selection of editorial board members using a 1-5 scale where 5 means "most important" and 1 means "least important."

WEIGHTING

5 of most importance
4 of great importance
3 of average importance
2 of less importance
1 of least importance

ability to represent the divergent interests of the readers	☐
evidence of scholarly ability (e.g. publications & research)	☐
position of administrative leadership in the field (e.g. educational institutions, foundations, government)	☐
in depth knowledge of literature and research in the field	☐
interest in working within the framework of objectives established for the journal	☐
generalist in the field of education	☐
representative of a school of scholarly thought (e.g. economics)	☐
representative of a minority group (e.g. race, sex)	☐
specialist in one of the areas of concern typically represented in the manuscripts submitted	☐
representative of a geographic region of the country (e.g. South)	☐
representative of a specific type of social institution (e.g. college, industry)	☐
professor of education	☐
other (specify)	☐

13. We would like to learn what the publishing procedures are for your journal. Please indicate below whether the procedure described is followed by your journal by checking "Yes", "No", or "Being Considered" for each procedure listed.

check one per item

Procedure	Yes	No	Being Considered
manuscripts submitted for publication are reviewed by more than one reader			
the critiques are transmitted in direct or edited form to the author			
readers are unaware of a manuscript's author and institutional affiliation			
your journal publishes articles by members of its editorial board			
your journal publishes its broad objectives and policies used in the review process			
your journal transmits to the author the criteria used in the operational evaluation of reviewed material			
your journal remunerates authors for their accepted contributions			
as an editor you feel a responsibility to assist the author in improving the quality of his work			
the journal's content consists almost entirely of unsolicited as opposed to invited manuscripts			
you normally use a form letter when an author is notified that his manuscript has not been accepted			
authors pay a page charge to have their articles appear earlier than their scheduled publication date			
authors are billed a fee for the publication of their articles (which have been accepted by a referee process)			
manuscripts are published in chronological order as they are received rather than grouped and published by topic area or some other scheme			

14. Manuscript acceptance decisions are made by:

check as many as apply

- the editor ☐
- reviewers ☐
- the editor with advice of reviewers ☐
- the editor and the staff of the editorial office ☐
- others (please specify) ☐

15. What is the degree of influence the reviewers have in the matter of manuscript disposition?

check one

- total ☐
- a great deal ☐
- an average amount ☐
- a little ☐
- none ☐
- not applicable ☐

16. How do you, as editor, use reviewers comments?

17. Is there a style guide available to authors who are preparing manuscripts for publication?

check one

yes ☐
no ☐

(If yes) Which one is it?

(If yes) Is it produced locally?

check one

yes ☐
no ☐

18. Approximately how many manuscripts does your journal receive and consider *yearly*?

number

19. What percent of the manuscripts received by the editor are initially dispatched as listed?

accepted by editor	%
rejected by editor	%
revised by editor	%
returned to author for revision	%
sent to the editorial board	%
sent to "special" readers	%
	Totals 100%

20. Of the manuscripts sent to readers, what percent are treated as follows?

acceptance suggested	%
rejection suggested	%
revisions suggested	%
	Totals 100%

21. When revisions are suggested, about what percent of those manuscripts are revised and resubmitted for publication?

%

22. When the manuscripts are received after revision, about what percent of them are acted on in the following manner?

accepted	%
rejected	%
other (specify)	%
	Totals 100%

23. What are the *two* most frequent reasons material is rejected by your journal?

24. Besides your own involvement, how many full-time (40 hours per week) *staff* equivalent personnel are employed in the editorial function of your journal (excluding editorial board, other readers, and printing personnel)?

Number

25. Does your journal have a managing editor?

check one

yes ☐
no ☐

(If yes) What functions does this person perform?

26. Who primarily comprises your journal readership (e.g. professors of education)?

27. What methods, if any, do you use to determine the interests of your readers?

28. If authors are invited to submit manuscripts, what methods do you use to identify potential authors?

29. Briefly describe the purpose of your journal (you may include materials already published).

Now we would like to ask you a few questions about the actual content of your journal.

30. Editors and reviewers of manuscripts base their decisions of the acceptability of manuscripts on a variety of criteria. Please indicate the importance of the following criteria as they relate to your journal.

WEIGHTING

5 of most importance
4 of great importance
3 of average importance
2 of less importance
1 of least importance

Process Criteria	Score
appropriateness of manuscript's total organization	☐
emotional neutrality of the author	☐
clarity and conciseness of writing	☐

WEIGHTING

5 of most importance
4 of great importance
3 of average importance
2 of less importance
1 of least importance

Process Criteria	Score
appropriate use of statistics	☐
theoretically grounded	☐
review of literature to date on the subject	☐
adherence to the journal's stylistic guidelines	☐
reputation of the author or his institution	☐
discussion of limitations of data or theory presented	☐
use of bibliography	☐
replicability (if research article)	☐
suggestions for future research/thought/action	☐
validity of logic used	☐
compatability with disciplinary ethics	☐
spirited style	☐
development of alternative interpretation of data presented	☐
use of standard empirical methodologies (experimental & non-exp.)	☐
use of experimental as opposed to non-experimental designs	☐

Content Criteria	Score
timeliness of topic	☐
applicability to practical or applied problems in the field	☐
depth (intensive examination of specific area)	☐
breadth (wide coverage)	☐
contribution to basic knowledge	☐
interest to readers	☐
professional controversiality of topic	☐
anticipatory of problems or issues in the field	☐

WEIGHTING

5. of most importance
4. of great importance
3. of average importance
2. of less importance
1. of least importance

Content Criteria	Score
contribution to education as a field of study	☐
orientation to a general rather than specialized readership	☐
social controversy surrounding topic	☐
good taste	☐
originality	☐
based on current research in field or research tradition	☐
of interest to professors of education	☐
descriptive orientation (case studies)	☐
of long-term definitive value	☐
value oriented (opinion pieces)	☐
policy oriented (position papers)	☐
presentation of data with limited discussion of implications	☐
theoretical orientation	☐
discussion of data implications	☐
discussion of "issues" in education	☐

31. There are a variety of methodologies and approaches to knowledge generation used by authors. Which approaches or models are typically used in manuscripts which appear in your journal?

32. What are the typical data sources from which authors' materials are drawn as the basis for manuscripts?

33. If your journal publishes book reviews, what criteria are used to single out books for review?

34. As you consider your role as editor, for what do you perceive yourself as being primarily responsible? Please indicate by using the numbers 1 through 5, where 5 means "most responsible" and 1 means "least responsible."

WEIGHTING

5. most responsible
4. largely responsible
3. responsible
2. less responsible
1. least responsible

Score

developing education or one of its specialities as a field of study ☐

initiating or influencing the resolution of problems or issues in the field ☐

influencing those outside the field of education to consider certain problems in education ☐

insuring quality control over manuscripts allowed to appear before the journal audience ☐

serving the interests of the journal's publisher ☐

serving the interests of the readers (i.e. to provide entertainment, information or foundational materials) ☐

other (please specify) ☐

35. Your perceived role in the field of education is the result of many factors. What experiences, individuals or books have had the greatest impact on the development of your personal approach to education? *(We realize the difficulty of this question, but please be as explicit as possible)*

36. What contemporary thinkers in the field of education share *your* perspective on the nature and function of education?

Just a few more questions now to help us analyze our data. Please use additional sheet if necessary.

1. Please indicate your post-secondary educational record (chronologically).

institution	degree	major field (emphasis)	years
			19 to 19
			19 to 19
			19 to 19
			19 to 19
			19 to 19
			19 to 19

2. Please indicate your professional experience (beginning with the most recent position).

title	duties	institution	years
			19 to 19
			19 to 19
			19 to 19
			19 to 19
			19 to 19

3. To which professional organizations do you currently belong and what offices do you hold in each, if any? *PLEASE DO NOT USE ABBREVIATIONS FOR ORGANIZATIONS*

organization	offices held

4. Please list any publications you may have had during the past three years and the type of publication (book, article, or monograph) that the material appeared in. *PLEASE DO NOT USE ABBREVIATIONS*

title	publication	type	year

5. To which professional journals do you *subscribe* or *read* regularly (at least one-half the issues published per year). *PLEASE DO NOT USE ABBREVIATIONS*

6. To what community (social, cultural, or religious) organizations do you currently belong?

7. What is your age?

check one

29 or younger ☐
30-34 ☐
35-39 ☐
40-44 ☐
45-49 ☐
50-54 ☐
55-59 ☐
60-64 ☐
65 or older ☐

8. What is your sex?

check one

male ☐
female ☐

9. Do you consider yourself a member of a minority group?

check one

Yes ☐
No ☐

(If Yes) Which one?

Please turn page

10. We would like to conclude this questionnaire by directing your attention to the futures of education. What do you anticipate for the futures of education in the next 15 years?

11. What functions do you believe your publication ought to play with regard to the futures you anticipate?

That's it. Many thanks for your help. Would you please now check back through the questionnaire to make sure you have answered all questions and then return the completed questionnaire to us in the self-addressed, postage paid, return envelope provided.

If you would like a preprint of the research report, please check here. ☐

WOULD YOU ALSO PLEASE RETURN A RECENT COPY OF YOUR JOURNAL ALONG WITH THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE. SUFFICIENT POSTAGE HAS BEEN AFFIXED TO THE RETURN ENVELOPE TO COVER THE COST OF MAILING. THANK YOU.

OFFICE OF MEDIA STUDIES
The Ohio State University
P.O. Box 3338
University Station
Columbus, Ohio 43210